40th day after death, at Easter, Whitsuntide, and on St. Dimitry's day) special dishes are eaten. 765

The course of the year in Ukraine is accompanied by many old customs which are not to be found among Russians but which resemble those of Southern Slavonic peoples. They spring from the world of Pontium and Greece and Rome; such are the festivals at Christmas ("koljada"), New Year ("novyj rik"), the consecration of water ("shtshedryj vetshir"), Easter ("hayivky"), the beginning of spring ("vesnyanky"), solstice ("kupalo"), the beginning of autumn ("Andrija") etc. They are accompanied by games and country dances, of which there are several thousand. The beginning of the most important agricultural operations is also celebrated (building the house, ploughing, sowing, driving the cows to pasture, hay and grain harvest etc). 796

Ukrainian demonology, founded on ancient animistic beliefs, has, in contrast to the Russian, lost all its terrors; the devil, for instance, is stripped of all horror. Magic and the belief in witchcraft are very probably of more modern, partly Christian origin. There is no higher mythology. The worship of fire and water is more developed and there are some faint traces of the worship of plants. Much of popular belief is preserved in fairy tales, fables, sagas, legends, proverbs and riddles, of which there is an inexhaustible store. Some 4 years ago Savtshenko found 2000 main variants of Ukrainian fairy tales, compared with about 1700 Russian and 1500 White Ruthenian versions. V. Hnatjuk has counted 327 fables of animals (exclusive of variants). We must finally mention the incredible wealth of popular stories and anecdotes. 771 538

But the Ukrainian people's most precious spiritual possession is their folk-poetry, one of the richest in Europe and characterised by aesthetic values, depth of poetic feeling and perfection of form. F. v. Bodenstedt, who published "Die poetische Ukraine" in 1843 put these Ukrainian poems above those of all other nations. Hohol said of them that they comprehended poetry and history and were a monument to the nation's ancestors. Every kind of song is represented, from the traditional songs of ritual and later ballads to the short song of to-day ("Shumky", "Kozatshky", "Kolomyjky" and "Tshabarashky"). These histo-

538 rical ballads (dumy) which glorify and preserve the whole of the past of Ukraine, are deservedly famous.

533 The Ukrainian folk-song which has been handed down in many collections and manuscripts from the 16th century, enjoys a great reputation both at home and abroad. These songs were sung at Lithuanian and Polish courts (14th - 16th centuries) and before Tsars and boyars in Moscow down to the second half of the 18th century. They were admired in Turkey and Italy too, and found honorable mention as early as 1675 in Herbigny's collection "Religiosae Kijovienses Cryptae".

534 The Ukrainian accompanies his singing on many instruments: there are the "kobza" and the "bandura", stringed instruments of foreign origin, cymbals which are unknown to the Russians, bag-pipes ("duda"), a peculiar kind of flute ("svyril") and the mountain pipe ("trembita"); primitive instruments like the lyre
535 have also persisted. The dance plays a comparatively minor part. Besides the ceremonious dances ("kolo") there are round dances ("hopak", "kozatshok" and "kolomyjka"), and the old sword dance is found among the Hutsuly.

531 A richly developed folk-art is on the same level as the folk-poetry and music; it finds expression above all in national costumes and ornaments, in painted Easter eggs, embroidery, in the complicated weaving and wood-carving patterns and in bead-work, ceramics, furniture and household utensils.

291 The ornate costumes often show in their embroidery influen-
531 ces from the East, the South and the Balkans. Particular attention is paid to embroidery on shirts, while women's skirts ("plakhty") and men's coats are often magnificent works of art for which, according to the district, homespun linen and woollen stuffs are used. Embroidery patterns utilise geometric forms as well as conventional flowers and leaves.

352 Furniture consists mainly of benches, a carved table, painted
531 and inlaid chests ("skryni") and a carved pottery cupboard ("mysnyk"). The room is, in addition, decorated with paintings, embroidered towels and carpets; in Eastern Ukraine the stove is also painted.

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDl Ukraine RDl

The Ukrainian Language

197 Ukrainian belongs to the Slavonic branch of the family of Indogermanic languages and this branch again divides into South Slav, West Slav and East Slav. Ukrainian, with Russian and White Ruthenian, forms the East Slav group which is an intermediary among Slavonic languages. Morphologically Ukrainian is like Russian, phonetically it approaches Serbo-Croatian and, as far as meaning goes, it has much in common with Polish. The north-west area of Ukrainian lies in the region of the home of Slavonic languages.

195 The development of Ukrainian as an independent language dates from the 9th century. Up to the end of the 18th century, old Church Slavonic, which had come with Christianity mainly from Bulgaria, served as the language of literature. With Ukrainian additions this has remained the language of the church up till the present. It is also the vehicle for historical chronicles (the Nestor Chronicle, the Chronicle of Galicia and Volynia) and the Igor Song, the greatest epic of the 12th century. Most of the literary monuments of those days, however, were destroyed in the wars against the Asiatic hordes. And yet the importance of old Church Slavonic as used in Ukraine spread far beyond the frontiers of the country; it became the court language of the Grand Princes of Lithuania and the official language in Moldavia. Literary activity increased in Ukraine in the 17th century but the subjects treated were taken from religion and so Church Slavonic continued to be the vehicle of literary expression. Historical works in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Cossack Chronicles by Velychko, Samovydets and the "History of the Ruthenes" (Istorija Rusow) are written in Church Slavonic with popular Ukrainian and Polish additions and many foreign words. At the same time individual writers are already writing in the national language, for example Nekrashevych, Gavatovych, partly also Skovoroda, while "Dumy", folksongs and anonymous verses are also written in Ukrainian.

197
538

About the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries Ukrainian finally managed to establish itself, for which Kotlarevskyj's travesty of the Aeneid (1798) was originally responsible. Literature becomes a national concern (cf. Kvitka-Osnovjanenko, Met-

lynskyj, Hrebinka etc.). Shevchenko, the greatest Ukrainian poet and Panko Kulish, the most eminent scholar of those days helped to perfect Ukrainian as a literary language. As all these writers came from Eastern Ukraine, the literary language grew from the East Ukrainian dialects of Poltava, Kharkiv and Kyiv.

In subsequent years Ukrainian became a still finer instrument in the hands of Marko Vovchok, Hlibiv, Konyskyj, Storoshenko and Shashkevych in Galicia and Fedjkovych in Bucovina.

After the Russian government laid a ban on Ukrainian (1876), literary and scientific life was concentrated in Lviv, the Ukrainian center in Austria-Hungary. This meant that western dialects came to their own, for many writers from Eastern Ukraine now published their works in the west (Myrnyj and Nechuj-Levytskyj, novelists; Starytskyj, dramatist and poet; Tobylevych, dramatist and later Hrinchenko, Kotsjubynskyj, Samijlenko and Lesja Ukrayinka, the greatest Ukrainian poetess). Ivan Franko is one of the greatest Ukrainians from the west at this time.

In Galicia a scientific and technical terminology developed so that in 1918 Ukrainian could take its place as the official language of the independent Ukrainian state and later of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. The following modern writers have done much to enhance the reputation of Ukrainian as a literary language: Olha Kobylanska, Bohdan Lepkyj, Vasyl Stefanyk (in a literary Pokutish-Volynian dialect), Oleksander Oles, Spyrydon Cherkasenko, Pavlo Tychyna, Maksym Rylskyj, Mykola Khvylovyj, Oleksa Slisarenko, Jurij Janovskyj, Jewhen Malaniuk, Bohdan Ihor Antonych etc.

The scientific study of the Ukrainian language was promoted above all by the Ukrainian Academy of Learning in Kyiv: Ukrainian has up till now been taught in lectures and tutorial courses in the universities of Berlin, Königsberg, Vienna, Münster, Halle, Prague, Naples and Paris. But Ukrainian philology was first studied in the 17th century (Grammar by M. Smotrytskyj in 1618). Two hundred years later A. Pavlovskyj's grammar, the first to deal with Ukrainian as a national language, appeared in Petersburg. And it is a Ukrainian, Oleksander Potebnya (1835—1891) who is the founder of Slavonic philology.

181 everywhere clearly reflected in language and literature, in habits and customs, in manifestations of religious life, in the cultural process, in music, art, and philosophy.

● 538 Taras Shevchenko, the intellectual leader of the Ukrainian
181 people and the national poet, was indissolubly bound to the black soil of his home, glebae adscriptus, the son of a serf, for whom a ransom of 2500 roubles had first to be paid by friends before he was physically free from the chains that bound him to the earth. To free him spiritually from Mother Earth was an impossibility, for the poet's soul was so firmly rooted in his native soil, that to have severed it from its roots would have meant spiritual death.

And it is not merely striving for external effect, but a genuine symbol of the spiritual make-up of the Ukrainian people that its national poet, though no more a serf but a fêted artist and poet, welcome in the best society of the Russian capital, is mostly portrayed in peasant costume and is handed down to posterity in this guise. Shevchenko, as a poet, was the people itself, so that external events in his life acquire symbolic significance for the entire nation. Ivan Franko, the most eminent poet of Western Ukraine, also a man of the people, bears witness to the peasantry as the foundation of a new period in the development of man:

"I am a peasant — prologue, not epilogue"

Another prominent champion of intellectual life in Ukraine is Skovoroda, a philosopher who lived in the 18th century. He is the Ukrainian Socrates and is a product of his native country, intimately connected with his surroundings and his time. We should be puzzled by his work if it were viewed apart from his relation to the broad mass of the peasantry; the whole significance of his teaching and influence can only be grasped if we remember that he was in direct contact with those elements in Ukrainian intellectual life which were deeply rooted in and inspired by the Black Earth.

V. Lypynskyj, the Ukrainian historian and sociologist of today, sums up and evaluates this intimacy with the soil in his "Letters to my Brother-Farmers", which appeared in 1921/22. He was the first to emphasise this essential feature of national

ideology and to make a militant peasantry the foundation and the pillar of the modern Ukrainian state. 538 181

We find an astonishingly simple, but profound synthesis of this entire peasant philosophy, the product of the soil, in "The Soil", a short, moving story by Vasyl Stefanyk, a contemporary poet; "Our destiny is the soil; forsake it and you are lost, cling to it and it will develop all your powers and draw out your very soul in the hollow of its hand; embrace it, subject yourself to it and it will suck the life-blood out of your veins — but in return, you have herds of sheep and horses and full stack-yards; and for your strength it will give you a cabin full of children and grand-children whose laughter is like silver bells and whose cheeks are red as the fruit of the snow ball tree . . ."

The profound love of the Ukrainian for the beauties of Nature springs from his connection with the soil, a love which seems to be firmly anchored in the depths of his soul. This aesthetic sense which is nurtured by natural forms, is reflected by the deep longing to express beauty of form, harmony of color and originality of theme in domestic surroundings, in dress or in the utensils of everyday life. Aesthetic, and not practical considerations always play the most important part, whether it be the construction of a church, the planning of a garden round a cottage, the weaving of an apron or a kerchief, the making of a table or a bench. 181 517

It is obvious that the very rich and valuable folk music and the no less rich and original folk poetry are also based on laws of aesthetic pleasure, derived from intimate intercourse with Nature and experience of her beauties.

And the Ukrainian's traditional and age-long contact with Nature is the tenacious bond between him and his culture and that of Western Europe, while at the same time it distinguishes him from the Muscovite, his neighbor in the North-East. For the latter people had never had any feeling for the soil; it regards agriculture not as an expression of love for Mother Earth, but as a necessity, or as a chance of making money. On the other hand, the Muscovites are the best traders among Slavonic peoples. The real farmer, too firmly rooted in the 181

181 earth and in his functions, who remains in the same place for generations, becomes too fixed in his habits and loses the mobility which is naturally the first essential quality of nomad peoples and which brings great advantages in trade.

The Ukrainian view of the world is based very definitely on idealism. The actions and resolutions of the Ukrainian are based not on objective reality as it confronts us, but on an ideal „reality" which contains many elements derived from imagination and fancy. Ukrainian history offers us many examples of this. I quote only two prominent instances:

181 Kostomariv, the Ukrainian historian, inspired by Messianic
●538 ideas, writes a gospel of the Ukrainian people, proclaiming its destiny as a leader in the history of mankind. The aim of this work was to bring new strength to the oppressed nation and to give new content to its life which was founded on a very sad reality; it soared so high in the clouds of idealising speculation, so oblivious of actual facts, that it was scarcely possible to establish a connection between it and real life. While it may be maintained that a people cannot be solely guided by conditions of life here and now, that it cannot do without ideals, that, on the contrary, development and progress are impossible without any inciting aim, even if it is beyond human grasp - nevertheless its efforts to rise must spring from its actual surroundings and not from the fantastic realm of the imagination. — Franko, in spite of the sad experience of his own life of suffering, is also an idealist who believes in man, in his innate goodness, his love of beauty and moral conduct. All the characters in his books, even the worst of them, often display good traits, or at least traces of a positive attitude to life which suffice to keep the chances of improvement open. It is more than obvious that these characters are not bad by nature, but that they have degenerated under the influence of different circumstances. Some critics assert that it was only this belief in an idealised humanity, in the possibility of progress, that gave Franko the moral courage to carry on in spite of bitter disappointment, and to work like one possessed for the welfare of his people and its culture.

Literature and Science

I.

●538 The literature of the Kyiv period which was mentioned in another connection found best expression in the "Song of Ihor", in which an unknown author sings of the unhappy campaign of the princes Ihor, Vsevolod, Svyatoslav and Volodymyr against the Polovtsy. This heroic epic, which must have been written before 1187, is composed of a series of short, but vivid, impressionist scenes with a tone, a rhythm and a mood of their own. It is by no means an imitation of Homer or of northern sagas or the Nibelungenlied though it is not difficult to detect marked northern elements in the work.

In addition to extensive translations in different fields of monastic literature, the following are worthy of special note as original works: "Ruska Pravda", an imposing monument of ancient Ukrainian law procedure; the "Chronicles", the most important and richest historical sources for the Kyiv era and later times in early Ukrainian history, the oldest — the Nestor Chronicle — being dated about the beginning of the 11th century. We should like to mention shortly a few original writers of theology: Metropolitan Clemens Smolatych (1147—1154) and Bishop Kyrill Turivskyj (1130—1182), a master of rhetoric.

We must assume that only a tiny fraction of the literary production of those times has come down to us and that the great mass of literature has completely disappeared in consequence of the political catastrophes which befell this country. Judging from the high level of what has remained we can regard the Kyiv era as the golden age of Ukrainian literature.

In the Lithuanian period the language and literature of Ukraine continue to develop without, however, attaining the

3: Mirchuk S-4 (no date) 1949 RDl Ukraine RDl

level of the earlier times. Western influences become more prominent; it is a time of transition, nor does the Reformation count for much, for even the Ukrainian translation of the Bible by Dr. Franz Skoryna in 1515 was a response to national needs and cannot be derived from external influences. The first Ukrainian books, on the other hand, were printed in 1491—93 by Shveipolt Fiol in a German printing-press in Cracow, and that in connection with the first Ukrainian academy (Ostroh 1577—1640), which had been formed for the purpose of publishing a critical edition of the Bible.

Literary and educative activity was really in the hands of the brotherhoods, which naturally were greatly interested in efforts to unite the churches. Polish literature worthy of note arose, important preliminary work was done in the province of language (Smotrytskyj's Grammar of Church Slavonic 1618), but it was only after Mohyla (1596—1647) re-organised the Academy in Kyiv that a cultural center was formed which was to play a decisive part in the literature of Ukraine for about 200 years.

Theological, rhetorical and philosophical works appear, the history text-book "Synopsis" by I. Gisel (died in 1684) goes through 30 editions, and Gregor Skovoroda (1722—1794), the most eminent philosopher of the 18th century in Eastern Europe and a student at the Kyiv Academy, wrote his books, the real significance of which is only being recognised now.

The cultural renaissance in Ukraine due to the brotherhoods and the Kyiv Academy brought new impetus to other provinces of intellectual life, as for instance dramatic art (Jakob Gavatovych 1598—1679, Mytrophan Dowhalevskyj 18th century. Demeter Rostovskyj, 1651—1705, the writing of history Samuel Velychko, died in 1728, Gregor Hrabyanka, died in 1737, and Gregor Poletyka, died in 1784), and also in plastic art which reached a high level of excellence in the Left Bank Region under Mazeppa's hetmanate. Young men in Ukraine were no longer content with native education; more and more they flocked to foreign, and above all, to German and Italian universities. Hetman Rozumovskyj's (1728—1803) intention to found a native uni-

871 versity in his own residential town of Baturyn was prevented from being realised by pressure from the government of Russia.

●538 But in the darkest of days a renaissance sets in, if slowly and scarcely noticeable. 1798 is the date of the appearance of the "Aeneid" by Ivan Kotlarevskyj (1769—1838). It presents actual life in Ukraine, written after a classical model in the form of a satire and in Ukrainian language, which thus becomes the language of literature and culture. Just at a time of greatest oppression, the greatest Ukrainian poet was born: Taras Shevchenko (1814—1861), the national genius, whose prophetic instinct sensed the course of development of native literature and who devoted his entire energy to furthering it. His poems, collected under the title of "Cobzar" (the popular minstrel) became the bible of every patriotic Ukrainian. He was exiled for his views to Siberia by the government of Russia and suffered great hardships which caused his early death. Shevchenko marked a brilliant end to the development of Ukrainian literature up to that onoment but at the same time, the starting-point for a new movement. Pantelejmon Kulish (1819—1897), a most productive writer of many-sided education, was one of Shevchenko's intimates; he distinguished himself not only as a poet, but also as an ethnographer, a historian, a critic, and a translator. In the second half of the 19th century Michael Drahomaniv (1841—1895), a professor at the university in Kyiv, later in Sophia, a follower of socialism and inclined to internationalism, produced much eminent work, though not always of positive value. About the same time in the area of Ukraine that belonged to Austria, Ivan Franko (1856—1916) was working as a poet, a scholar and a politician of renown, being besides Shevchenko the most important personality in modern Ukraine. Round about the turn of the century there was a great increase in the number of Ukrainian writers; among the best known are Lesja Ukrayinka (1872—1913), the author of wonderful poems in dramatic form; Vasyl Stefanyk (1871—1937), whose short stories often portray the tragic fate of Ukrainian peasants; Les Martovych (1871—1916), an accurate observer of life not only among peasants, but also among the educated provincial classes in Ukraine; Volodymyr Vynnychenko (1880), a representative of

Ukrainian decadence, wrote not uninteresting dramas, novels and short stories which, however, had no great influence on the public. The following are the most noteworthy members of the younger generation: Gregor Chuprynka (1879—1919), an impressionist who was shot by the bolshevists; Ol. Oles (1878—1943) worked at Prague as an emigrant; the short-story writer Arkhyp Teslenko (1882—1911) who died early after having been banished to the north by the Imperial Government; Petro Karmanskyj (1878), whose lyrics have a delicate, almost exotic tone; Bohdan Lepkyj (1872—1942), who has written historical novels. Olha Kobylanska (1865—1945) was a worthy representative of Bucovina. 538 ●

Among the many representatives of the world of science we mention Borys Hrinchenko (1863—1910), the editor of a comprehensive dictionary of the Ukrainian language; Agantangel Krymskyj (1871), a famous orientalist, the organiser of the Ukrainian Academy in Kyiv and the supreme head of the newly created state of Ukraine, Michael Hrushevskyj (1886—1934), the most important Slavonic historian of the present day and author of a monumental book on the history of Ukraine. 814

The literature of Soviet Ukraine which is completely under the influence of bolshevism and Moscow has produced no talent of merit. Out of the great number of prose writers of novel and short story only a few original writers may be mentioned, such as Mykola Khvylovyj (1893—1933) who was driven by the cruelty of real life to commit suicide; Valeryan Pidmohylnyj (1901), Gregor Kosynka (1899—1935), whose end was tragic, too. Khvylovyj is noteworthy because of his desire to enrich Ukrainian culture with western influence and to keep it aloof from northern ideology; pressure from Moscow, however, forced him to abandon his theory. One great master of lyric poetry has appeared, namely Paul Tychyna (1891), though his gift of song has completely dried up in later years. Volodymyr Sosiura (1898) and Eugen Plushnyk (1898) are only worth mentioning for the variety of the rhythms they use; Valeryan Polishchuk (1897) is the founder of a new kind of meter, the so-called "vers libre". One of the most promising and gifted poets of today is Maksym Rylskyj (1895), a neoclassicist, who tried long 538

538 to uphold his artistic independence in the face of official pressure. But after many years of an unequal struggle his power of resistance broke down and to-day he writes in accordance with instructions from high places. The works of the dramatist Korniychuk, lately awarded the prize of the Union amounting to 100 000 roubles, are of no great artistic value, but only demonstrate a certain obvious tendency.

II.

814 Scientific work of any significance does not begin in Ukraine until the nineteenth century and is confined for the first decades to history and ethnography. This research, in so far as it was done in the Right Bank Region, received a certain support from the Russian government which, after quelling the Polish rebellion in 1831 wished to produce scientific proof that the areas right of the Dnipro have always been what the official language termed "Russian", and that Polish claims were therefore quite unjustified. Governmental circles in the Left Bank Region were not so interested in that question and so it was left to the private initiative of Ukrainian patriots either to preserve the ancient monuments of the glorious past themselves or to hand them over to the safe keeping of the Society for History and Philology at Kharkiv university.

The first proper attempt to organise Ukrainian research activity on a large scale is connected with the foundation of the "South-West Section of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society" in Kyiv, which united eminent Ukrainian scholars of the day for the purpose of working together. In a short time the society had acquired a high reputation in European scientific circles, which it owed as much to the results of its research as to its valuable publications. Then came the unhappy year 1876, when it was forbidden to speak or write Ukrainian and when the Kyiv Geographical Society was dissolved. Thus every possibility of scientific work was closed and scholars were forced by the pressure of altered circumstances to transfer their activity to one of the institutes affiliated to the universities and here, protected by the cloak of officialdom, continue working for Ukraine.

for Austria as for Galicia. The part which this theater had to play in the renaissance of the Ukrainian people in its western areas was similar to that of the Ukrainian stage within the Russian empire. The difficulties with which actors and stage-managers had to cope were no less great, though of a different nature; for its fate was not determined by the Russian censor or the almighty governor general, but by its empty purse. Ukrainians living in Austria-Hungary had no capital at their disposal for the support of the theater and Polish influence on the government in Vienna was so powerful that it was able to prevent the granting of all subsidies to the Ukrainian theater. This situation is expressed by the fact that the four million tax-paying Ukrainians in the Habsburg Empire had not one single permanent theater, but were compelled to be content with travelling companies up to the war of 1914. It is clear that matters were not improved after the debâcle of 1918, when Galicia was annexed to Poland. When Ukrainians in Lviv attempted to build a theater with their own money on a site that had been purchased before, the Polish authorities managed to prevent the realisation of the plan. 538

In Galicia, too, repertories of theatrical companies consisted mainly of subjects from rural life. It is due to this and to the fact that these companies had no permanent home, but also toured through all the smaller towns in Galicia, that the influence of the theater on the population was greater and deeper than that exercised by urban drama of higher artistic merit. Its direct appeal, its proximity to real life aroused in the mass of the Ukrainian peasants the feeling and the demand for dramatic representations. As a result of the fruitful, if most laborious, detailed work accomplished by Ukrainian artists, amateur theatrical societies were formed in almost every village here as elsewhere throughout Ukraine, which, as they attracted young people, exercised a great educational influence.

CHAPTER SIX

The Literary Renaissance

At the beginning of the Ukrainian struggle for independence, the time was ripe for a new period in the literature. There were still living some of the old masters of the nineteenth century as Ivan Levytsky-Nechuy, who died shortly after the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic. Lesya Ukrainka and Kotsyubynsky, the two foremost of the writers of the next generation, had died in 1913 and Oles, the representative of the generation of 1905, was in retirement. 538 ●

This cleared the way for a younger group, as Tychyna and Rylsky, who were already testing their abilities when the First World War broke out.

The outbreak of the struggle in 1917 called back into life such publications as the *Literary-Historical Journal* which had been suppressed in 1914 by the imperial Russian government. It attracted to its pages the leading men of the older generation who were largely populist in their political views and in it appeared the writings of such men as Prof. M. Hrushevsky, Vynnychenko, Samiylenko, Oles, Vorony, G. Chuprynka and L. Starytska-Chernyakivska. The list of contributors includes most of the people who had already established their reputation and the journal had a short but distinguished career.

When the Ukrainian National Republic finally was overthrown and the Soviet regime established, many of these older writers disappeared from Ukraine. Oles retired to Prague, and Vynnychenko and many others made their way to Western Europe. Even those who remained in Ukraine found themselves out of sympathy with the new government and relapsed into silence, but even this

538 did not save them for many were arrested and executed at various times.

It was only natural that the period of the civil war was not conducive to the production of artistic literature. For those who were willing to cooperate, there were many posts open in the government, but the pressure of public affairs distracted them and left them little time for belles-lettres. For others who had less taste for political and public life, the obvious course was to retire to the villages and there meditate and work in silence with scanty hope for the immediate publishing of their works. This was the course largely pursued by Tychyna and Rylsky and their friends, together with many of the Symbolists.

However, during 1917 and 1918 new almanacs and journals put in an appearance and these could hardly fail to express the political struggles, for some of them, as *Mystetstvo* (Art), were definitely leftist in character and others were the product of various groups and schools of writers.

[626] With the final establishment of Soviet power, the literature lost most of the freedom which it had acquired in the years of struggle. The Communists lost no time in suppressing all the old publications and in establishing their own. These were more or less strictly censored. and it was impossible from the beginning to publish any work which might awaken the suspicions of the new regime.

At the same time in Ukraine, as in the RSFSR, the Communist attitude toward literature was not clearly defined. The new authorities spread over the country a whole chain of Proletkult (Proletarian Art) centres with the idea of a speedy development of a new proletarian art. Yet the experiment was not too successful and, as an outcome of the similar developments in Petrograd and Moscow, these were soon suppressed but not until they had created a taste for writing in many of the younger and often uneducated generation, who were attracted by the slogans and the hopes inspired by the Communists.

This marked a definite break with the past and it was sufficient to eliminate from their commanding positions most of the older

men. However, there was no official attitude adopted toward 538 ● literature, no definite command to write in accordance with a definite style, provided that the authors stayed away from subjects that seemed to be openly anti-Communist.

The authors who were closest to the new regime were those that had approached Communism through the Left Social Revolutionists (the Borotbisty) and who considered themselves a "proletarian" group in the new terminology. Many of the earlier members of this group, as the impressionistic poet Vasyl Chumak and the prose impressionist Andry Zalyochy and also Hnat Mykhaylychenko, were killed during the civil wars or in various uprisings. In a sense they were fortunate and so was the outstanding novelist, Vasyl Blakytny, who died in 1925. Blakytny's death was widely lamented as the death of a distinguished author of revolutionary romanticism, but it was only a few years later when he, like the other Borotbisty, was accused of "unreliability," his works were officially banned and the plaque which marked the house where he died was removed.

Artistically, the Symbolists, as Tychyna, were technically the most advanced on the literary side. They were consciously trying to adapt the Western, and especially the French, conceptions of Symbolism to Ukrainian and without going into the decadent features of French Symbolism, they sought to acclimate in Ukrainian many of the devices and the metres that had been worked out in the West.

Close to them was the group of the Neo-Classicists headed by Mykola Zerov. The members of this group, too, endeavored to produce high art with as few political overtones as possible. The group, which also included the poet Maksym Rylsky, sought to draw their inspiration from the classical world and they stressed the ancient connections between the Black Sea and the classical world of the Mediterranean.

Both the Symbolists and the Neo-Classicists were in their hearts more or less hostile to the revolution, in so far as it was a destroyer of cultural values but they were anything but reactionaries or anti-Communists in the ordinary sense of the word. They were

● 638 rather far removed from the developments of the present, interested in literature and literary criticism and standing for the preservation of cultural values.

In view of the relations between the Communists in Ukraine and those in the RSFSR, it was only natural that all of the literary debates that went on in Moscow should find an echo in Ukraine. This was the period when Bukharin, Trotsky and Lunacharsky were debating very seriously the relations between the Communists, the proletarian writers and the so-called "fellow-travellers" who sympathized more or less sincerely with the revolution but who had not taken the full step and become members of the Communist Party. It was in this latter group that the greater Russian writers of the day were to be found and many of them had already achieved fame before the revolution. In 1925 they succeeded in obtaining what seemed to be a certain recognition by the party and it was on the basis of these decisions and this standard that both the Symbolists and the Neo-Classicists continued to be able to publish.

At the same time Ukrainian literature could not be considered as a mere reflection of any of these groups. There was still too much consciousness of Ukrainian independence to make the more able authors merely blind imitators of a foreign literature. Besides, [177] the contacts which still existed with Western Ukraine under Polish rule brought it about that even the Eastern Ukrainians were influenced both by the Polish and Austrian developments and writers as Stefanyk were read almost as much in Kiev and Kharkiv as they were in Lviv and Stanislaviv.

The taking over by the Borotbisty and the Ukapisty of the Commissariat for Education could not fail to have a definite effect upon the leftist writers who dreamed of establishing not only a proletarian literature but also a Ukrainian proletarian literature, and with this purpose in mind there developed at the capital of Kharkiv and also in Kiev and elsewhere a new series of literary schools and movements, each of which based itself upon its own interpretation of the revolution. They started in general from two contradictory positions, depending on whether they stressed

1 [after Communist rule was established in Ukraine -- Analyst]

the revolutionary ardor of the peasants or that of the proletariat 538 and this was roughly parallel to the division between the peasant and the factory writers in the RSFSR.

Thus the organization, the *Plough,* as its name implies, was the organ of that group which emphasized the role of the peasants and their connection with the proletariat. They admitted to membership every one who wished to write, provided he belonged to the "laboring element." Naturally, with such a slogan, much of their work was not of a high order but the leaders considered their work as educational and they did not object when the more competent and trained writers dropped away or joined other organizations.

Opposed to them was the *Hart* (the Tempering of Steel) which existed from 1923 to 1925. This based itself far more solidly on the proletarian writers of the cities. It stressed urban and factory life and saw the triumph of Communism transforming the peasantry into a type far more like that of the city proletariat than that of the old, independent farmer. Yet this group, too, was very soon torn by questions over the relations between the Russian and Ukrainian Communists and it split up after the publication of its first almanac.

The sharpest defender of a definite Ukrainian line in the *Hart* was Mykola Khvylovy and he very soon split away from the more moderates and those seeking a closer alliance with the Russians. He formed the group *Urbino* in 1925 and out of this grew the *Vaplite,* the Free Academy of Proletarian Literature, which became the rallying ground for all of the more consciously alert members of the leftist and Communist groups. It was with the *Vaplite* that there were associated most of these men, as Arkady Lyubchenko, Yury Yanovsky, Petro Panch, the dramatist Mykola Kulish, the theatrical producer Les Kurbas and such poets as Tychyna, Mykhaylo (Mike) Yohansen and Mykola Bazhan. This was the outstanding literary development of the period of Ukrainization and under the leadership of Khvylovy, they took a definite political stand on all the questions of the day.

There were similar groups in Kiev. Thus there was formed

538 the *Aspis* (Association of Proletarian Writers) in 1923 and from this, in its turn, was developed the *Lanka* or Link in 1924-6 and later the *MARS* (the Workshop of the Revolutionary Word), 1926-8 with such members as Evhen Pluzhnyk, Dmytro Falkivsky and T. Osmachka. They sought to keep themselves somewhat free from excessive flattery of the government and in general shared the general attitude of the *Vaplite* in Kharkiv.

Another movement which had appeared just before the revolution was Futurism which, in the person of its leader, Mykhaylo Semenko, denied totally the artistic value of all preceding literary schools. The revolution gave this, too, the possibility of boasting that by its denial of the past it was the true mouthpiece for revolutionary art, even though its successes were relatively slight and many of its productions were almost unintelligible to the general public. The Futurists, too, engaged in the usual process of splitting and recombining during the height of this period, when the authors were still relatively free to express their own thoughts.

Beyond these again was the great mass of the proletarian authors. These were men, usually of less artistic ability, who listened eagerly to the general slogans put out by the Communists in Moscow and Kharkiv. They followed blindly the established formulas for the production of Communist literature. They had, in fact, the general attitude of the Russian On-Guardists and they were more renowned for their reliability and skill in following the general line of the Party than they were for their literary originality or their moral and artistic integrity. They were in general the literary hacks of the day, often with slight preliminary education, and proletarian in more senses than one.

Thus during the period of Ukrainization, the literature moved along two distinct planes. Leaving aside those authors who endeavored to work in an anti-political world, there were those who blindly followed the political line and those men who ventured to think for themselves but along the lines of Communist thought. These latter were the logical outcome of the ideas of the Borotbisty and the Ukapisty and the proclamation of the independence of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. At times they could even

be critical of the actual developments of the day but in their hearts they accepted the general articles of belief and sought to give them a fuller significance. The way was open to make them a loyal opposition to the regime and for several years they seemed to be attaining the position which they desired. 638

5: Manning S-4 (no date) 1953 RD1 Ukraine RD1

CHAPTER EIGHT

Mykola Khvylovy

Shumsky and Skrypnyk, as Commissars for Education, defended the position of the Ukrainian language in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and among the Ukrainians in the entire USSR. They worked to break down the anti-Ukrainian attitude that had existed from the beginning in the Communist Party of Ukraine, but as men holding public office and busied with the political and administrative problems that were thus raised, they did not go further. The additional step to point out the road for this newly conscious Ukrainian Communism was taken by Mykola Khvylovy. 538 ● 186

Khvylovy, who was born in 1891, was already well known as a Communist writer. A fearless author of strong convictions, he had worked his way early in the Civil War to the position of the Communists and had served as a commissar in the Ukrainian Communist Army. He was now one of the recognized Communist writers and moving spirit of the leading literary group, the *Vaplite* (the All-Ukrainian Academy of Proletarian Literature), the members of which were devoted to him.

Khvylovy was an ardent admirer of Trotsky and when the break came between Trotsky and Stalin, he took the side of the former and held, with him, that the cause of counter-revolution had triumphed and that the rise of a Soviet bureaucracy was merely a return to the old unhappy state. Khvylovy had become a Communist solely because of his belief that it was only through Communism and Communist teachings that humanity could achieve its goal of liberation and self-development and he was impatient with anything that seemed to contradict this theory.

538
186 He was at the same time an ardent Ukrainian. He could not bear to see the subordinate position which Ukraine and the Ukrainian Communist Party held in the USSR and he resented the already obvious attempts to present Moscow as the supreme representative of Communism and of a general Communist culture.

In 1925, he began to publish a weekly pamphlet as a supplement to the central newspaper *Visti* under the title *Culture and Life*. In this he advocated the development of an independent Ukrainian Communist culture which would be distinct from that of Moscow. His first articles, which were purely literary in character, started a lively controversy in the press and in public meetings. It was difficult to attack him, for he based his arguments entirely upon the official statements of the Communist Party and he revealed the inconsistency which existed in these official statements. The entire Ukrainian section of the KP/b/U was aroused and so was the whole of Ukrainian society. Here was a popular writer who dared, in the name of Ukrainian Communism, to take the statements of the Communist Party (KP/b/U) seriously and to draw the logical conclusions from them. These articles he then republished in book form, *Quo Vadis* (1925), *Thoughts against the Current* (1926) and *The Sociological Equivalent* (1927).

Khvylovy's original arguments had urged the necessity for the new Communist Ukrainian literature to assimilate and build itself upon the great European cultural and literary tradition as exemplified in its greatest and noblest writers and thinkers and not to confine itself to being, as it had been too often in the past, a mere appanage and colony of Russia. He deplored the already evident tendency of Ukrainian Communist literature to base itself on the pronunciamentos of Moscow without testing and analyzing them and this led him to proclaim as his slogan "Away from Moscow."

"The ideas of the proletariat we all know without the guidance of Moscow. Only the young Ukrainian nation, the Ukrainian proletariat and its Communist intelligentsia are the true bearers of the great revolutionary socialist ideas and they must not orient themselves on the centre of All-Union Philistinism, on the Moscow sirens. They need to orient themselves on themselves and Europe, but not

on the Europe of Spengler, which is declining and which we all hate, but on the Europe of the great civilization, the Europe of Goethe, Darwin, Byron, Newton, Marx, etc. That is the Europe that the first legions of the Asiatic Renaissance cannot dispense with." 538 186

In another article he wrote. "Russia is an independent country. Independent. We too are independent. Insofar as our literature has its own path of development, we must ask ourselves the question as to which of the world literatures it is to follow. It is not the Russian in any case. This is positive without any reservations. Ukrainian poetry must flee from Russian literature as rapidly as it can. The reason is that Russian literature has dominated us for centuries as the master of the situation and has trained our psychology to slavish imitation. To base our young art upon it means the halting of our development.

"The time has come to put an end to all Little Russianism, to Ukrainophilism and to Prosvitaism (an allusion to the net of elementary Ukrainian educational institutions existing before the Communist Revolution), and also to ragtag Moscophilism."

The ideas which Khvylovy expressed about literature had a far wider significance, for they could be applied to every aspect of Ukrainian life and activity. As the discussion shifted to the broader questions that were involved, Stalin, who was engrossed in the struggle with Trotsky, interfered personally. He wrote in April, 1926, as general secretary of the VKP/b [the All Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)] to the KP/b/U: "If the Western European proletariat look with longing on the banner which waves in Moscow, the Ukrainian Communist Khvylovy has nothing else to say in favor of Moscow but to urge the Ukrainian workers to flee from Moscow. What is to be said about the other Ukrainian intellectuals of the non-Communist camp, if the Communists begin to speak and not only speak but write in our Soviet press in the words of Khvylovy?"

This was the signal for a new series of attacks on Khvylovy by the complacent russifiers in the Communist Party of Ukraine. All the members of the Executive Committee except Shumsky joined

538 in the attack and so did their satellites, but Khvylovy stood his
186 ground and reiterated more strongly his demands for an independent Ukrainian cultural development and repeated Trotsky's attacks on Moscow as the centre of the new Philistinism which had devoured the revolution.

By the end of the year, Khvylovy and the *Vaplite* found it necessary to prepare a formal letter of apology and self-accusation for publication. However humble and self-accusing he was in this letter, he was thoroughly insincere, for he had no intention of changing his course and in a few weeks he resumed his hammering at the forces and advocates of Moscow. He merely sought to gain time to let his words sink in more deeply into the consciousness of the Ukrainian people. His opponents recognized this and throughout 1926 and 1927, they ceaselessly attacked him. In fact, at the end of 1927, at the Tenth Congress of the KP/b/, Kaganovich declared that Khvylovy was an "echo of the bourgeois and kurkuls who base their hopes for the restoration of a bourgeois government in Ukraine on the forces of an armed foreign imperialism."

Khvylovy's article on *Ukraine or Little Russia* was refused publication by the *Visti* on the orders of the party authorities and renewed efforts were made to silence him. This it was impossible to do decisively until the final expulsion of Trotsky from the Communist Party, for the leading representatives of Moscow could not be sure until that time that many of the expressions used by the daring writer would not be incorporated into the principles of the party itself, even though Trotsky had never been known for any pro-Ukrainianism.

To make his cause more vocal, Khvylovy began to express his basic ideas not only in his publicistic articles but in his artistic stories and novels which were very popular among all classes of literate Ukrainians. The climax came with his *Woodsnipes,* the first part of which appeared in 1928.

This was strictly a propaganda novel written with all of Khvylovy's artistic skill. In this he depicts types of his Ukrainian opponents, the Russian Bolshevists, the typical careerists, and the character of Aglaya, the new Ukrainian type who speaks in the words

and with the views of the author. She denounces the gloomy devils in the Moscow chauvinists who were bent upon the enslavement of Ukraine in the name of the International. "It is the same Russian intelligent-internationalist, who willingly talks about the self-determination of nations . . . only not of those which are in the Soviet Union. Here it sees only followers of Petlyura and does not notice its own interference. It here thinks that Ukrainian culture exists . . . as an Austrian intrigue. He points out to Europe the achievements of the Russian genius and leads out into the arena the other peoples of the Union, as the Russian tsarism maintained its own zoo for the people it had conquered. In a word, he is an internationalist who, behind his cosmopolitanism, preserves his own zoological nationalism." 538 ● 186

The second part of the novel was completed and Khvylovy went abroad. As a result of the storm that this novel aroused, the journal of the *Vaplite* was suppressed. The moment was apparently chosen in the hope that Khvylovy would maintain his position and be forced into emigration, from which his influence in the Ukrainian Soviet Republic would be lessened, if not destroyed. Instead, Khvylovy promised to have the manuscript of the second part destroyed and returned to Ukraine.

"By destroying the *Woodsnipes* and thus buying the right to return home . . . and to continue the struggle in more limited forms," wrote Yur. D., in the introduction to the Salzburg edition of the book,—"Khvylovy assured the possibility of the appearance of a numbers of plays by Kulish, of the pieces of the Berezil, his own compilation of the *Literary Fair,* the Ukrainian films of Dovzhenko, the Ukrainization of the higher schools,—in a word he postponed for five years the assassination of the great cultural renaissance."

The other members of the *Vaplite* joined in their own way with Khvylovy in painting the contrasts between the high ideals set forth in the decrees of the Communist party and the sordid reality of the Bolshevik bureaucracy in the Ukraine, who were making no attempt to turn the visions of the party principles into the life of the people. All of the writers were attacked as Khvylovy and

● 538 sooner or later silenced, even though for some time they worked
186 with him in publishing the *Literary Fair,* a medley of works of all kinds with pungent introductions and comments.

This tendency became so marked that in 1927, Andry Khvylya, one of the most faithful supporters of the official line of the Party declared of the story of Valeriyan Pidmohylny, the *Third Revolution,* "It makes it seem as if Makhno was at the head of the revolutionary movement, that the villagers were with him, as their earth bore them, and that the Bolsheviks were running after Makhno and collecting cream, . . . that the Communist Party were a group of plotters, who had no connection with the masses but through espionage were profiting by the great deeds of other people." Khvylovy found another Communist ally in the person of Volobuyiv. He was a young Ukrainian economist who utilized the materials on the Ukraine prepared by Prof. V. Dobrohayev and published in the central organ of the KP/b/U, the *Bolshevik of Ukraine,* a series of articles which showed the extent of the exploitation of Ukraine by Moscow. He proved clearly that Moscow was carrying out a colonial policy in respect to Ukraine, instead of treating it as an equal republic. This was a sensational revelation for the twenties. Later the works of both Volobuyiv and Khvylovy were condemned by Moscow as anti-Communist and Volobuyiv, shortly after 1933, was exiled to a Siberian prison.

The growing pressure upon Ukraine, the forced collectivization which was beginning and the beginning of the great famine of 1932-3, completed the disillusionment of Khvylovy, who up to this time had maintained a stubborn faith in the principles of Communism and its aspirations for a better future for the common man. His later works made it clear that he had lost all hope that the revolution would accomplish anything except a continuation of the streams of blood that were beginning again to flow throughout Ukraine. Yet there was nothing for him to do but to continue his work.

186 National Republic, who had gone abroad after its collapse and
814 who had been invited back to take part in the work of the Ukrain-
687 ian Academy of Sciences. The government produced what seemed
661 to be definite evidence against these people but the curious fact
● [538] was that this evidence was strangely inconsistent with all of their previous activity. On the prisoner's bench were such men as Serhey Yefremiv, the leading scholar of Ukrainian literature and a relative conservative, the academiciam Mykhaylo Slabchenko, a former Social Democrat, Prof. Joseph Hermayze, a former member of the Executive Committee of the same party, and the well-known writer L. Starytska-Chernyakivska, who was close to Efremiv and who had more or less dropped out of the modern literary movement and was living in practical retirement.

The Soviet record of the trial strongly suggests that all those factions which, during the existence of the Ukrainian National Republic had utterly failed to come to any agreement, had somehow or other composed their differences in the days when Ukrainian sentiments seemed to be dominant in the ranks of the Communist Party and when there were outstanding Communists, like Khvylovy and Skrypnyk, pleading the Ukrainian cause. Yet, as was to be the case in almost all of the later trials, the court record based upon the testimony of the NKVD did not give any clue to the treasonable acts of which the defendants were accused and if they did, the stories passed belief. There was, likewise, no indication of the serious plans on which the organization was working or any details of its formal organization.

All the information that was revealed suggested that it was a definitely anti-Communist movement engineered by a group of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists who objected to the Communist program of Ukrainization. There was no hint that the accused had any connection with the derussification program of Skrypnyk or the demand of Khvylovy and his friends of the *Vaplite* for the development of a definite Ukrainian Communism. The Society for the Liberation of Ukraine appeared like a ghost from the past and the prosecution seemed to have the tacit support of even those elements which were working for Ukrainization.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

The Turning of the Cultural Tide

The Ukrainian Communists did not realize what they were doing when they launched their campaign against the bourgeois intellectuals and the aged scholars in the Academy of Sciences. For the first time since the period of Ukrainization had started, they had definitely called the attention of Moscow to the existence in Ukraine of a survival of the old independent mode of thinking which had animated the Ukrainian leaders in the struggle for an independent state of their own and they had coined a name for it, bourgeois Ukrainian nationalism. That was to recur again and again and lead to their own ruin.

It is remarkable that neither Skrypnyk nor Khvylovy realized this earlier. Both men in their own way were seriously threatening the unity of the Soviet Union, to which as an ideal they were loyal. Both men, Skrypnyk in the political field and Khvylovy in literature, realized the danger to Ukraine of substituting Russianism for Communism. Both men accepted in different senses the basic ideals of Communism and both believed in a Communist International which would offer all peoples full rights of cultural and political development. Neither one understood that the Comintern was a shadow structure which was totally dependent upon the forces operating in Moscow and that the situation in 1928 and 1929 was basically different from that ten years before.

In the RSFSR the charter of liberty for the fellow travellers which had been promulgated in 1925 was practically abolished by the granting of extreme power of control to Averbakh and the RAPP (the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) which, to all intents and purposes, was issuing orders as to how the writers should support the Five Year Plan.

626 It was perfectly natural that a similar situation should develop
● 538 in Ukraine. The various schools of serious writing, as the *Vaplite,* stood out against this regimentation and ably defended their position, but that position was indefensible in the face of political pressure and without being conscious of any inconsistency, Skrypnyk, as a good Communist and a member of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) was willing to exert pressure to bring the literary organization of Ukraine in line with that of the All-Union Communist Party at the very same time when he was deliberately thwarting the unifying tendencies of that party.

[186] The first sign of the changed order came with the arrest and
[68] deportation of M. Ivchenko for his novel *Working Powers* because it endeavored to express in a concrete form the problem of fitting the ideals of the various national groups into the stereotyped formula which was now fashionable. Next came the difficulties of Khvylovy over his novel *Woodsnipes,* despite his willingness to secure an opportunity for further work by the destruction of the second part of the novel.

It must be remembered that the groups which were now being attacked were not by their essential declarations anti-Communist. They reflected, rather, the disillusionment of many people with the prevailing manifestations of Communism, the growing realization that the Communist regime was not giving the people that ideal reality which its teachings indicated they should easily win.
[536] That was the gist of the drama by M. Kulish, the *People's Malakhy,* which reflected the contrast between the ideals of a high-minded but somewhat simple village Don Quixote and the realities of life on any particular level. This, as other of his plays, was well presented in the Berezil Theatre, directed by Les Kurbas, a Western Ukrainian who had developed in Kiev into one of the great producers and had pushed the Ukrainian theatrical art to its highest development. Writings of the same character had marked some of the early Russian works of A. N. Tolstoy after the revolution but, being a Great Russian, he was not involved in the endless controversies over the national questions and, like most of the Russian authors, he was able to work out a satisfactory agreement with the

5: Manning S-4 (no date) 1953 RD1 Ukraine RD1

Stalin policies. This was not true of the Ukrainian authors who felt a steadily increasing pressure from the Communist authorities. 626 538

The vast majority of the more mediocre authors who had sought to follow unhesitatingly the party line found it very natural to form themselves into the VUSPP (the All-Ukrainian Society of Proletarian Writers) in 1927. They published a monthly journal, *Hart* and the *Literary Journal,* and to show their real internationalism they supported a Russian proletarian journal, the *Krasnoye Slovo* (the Red Word) and a Jewish paper, *Di Royte Welt.* It was only natural that this group should seek support by applying for membership in the VOAPP (the All-Union Society of Proletarian Writers) which, of course, was completely under the domination of the Russian Section, the RAPP. They thus became the thinking or unthinking agents by which the Russians could direct their blows against Ukrainian literature.

On the other hand, there came during these years a similar concentration of those writers who rejected bourgeois ideas but who still were working to develop a Ukrainian Communism in the true sense of the word. Yet they were forced to shift their positions constantly and hence there came a hectic but yet vital series of publications.

The Futurists who denied the value of the past and worked in experimental efforts were naturally the opponents of Khvylovy and the *Vaplite* and finally, in 1927, they united with some of the other radical groups (in the literary sense) to form the *New Generation* which continually published declarations of policy and of adherence to Communist ideas, but this group also drew upon itself the criticism of the VUSPP because it aimed for the adaptation of literature to the Ukrainian scene.

On the other hand, the *Vaplite* was very soon compelled to disband. It did so voluntarily but the bulk of the abler writers immediately started to publish the *Literaturny Yarmarok* (The Literary Fair) in which, under the guise of apolitical writing, they poured out scarcely veiled criticism of their opponents. This, too, was soon under attack and then it was reorganized as the *Prolitfront* (the Union of Studies of the Proletarian Literary Front). This

626 device was also too obvious, for the new journal continued to
538 criticize the Russian policy and in 1931 it was forced to disband and most of the members who wanted to continue to write passed into the VUSPP, which, with all its rigid adherence to the party line, could not be too sure as to what that party line really was.

At one point in his career Skrypnyk, who was in many ways opposed to Khvylovy, dreamed of the establishment of a Federation of the Unions of Revolutionary Writers of Ukraine. He succeeded in forcing this upon the Futurists and many smaller leftist groups and also the *New Generation,* but his failure to make this real in 1931 was but a sign of the future.

By this time the VUSPP, along with the RAPP, had become the dominating force politically and Skrypnyk was forced to give up his endeavors and to allow most of his Federation members to join the VUSPP. This was but another step in the decay of all literary schools and it reflected the period of uncertainty and of a definite degree of opposition to the domination of the RAPP.

By the end of the twenties, the opportunities for independent thinking in literature had grown exceedingly few and scattered. There were still, in general, only the two currents of Ukrainian and Russian Communism, and the former was definitely beginning to wane under the continual attacks that were delivered both by its opponents and the Communist Party through its official organs.
[186] Still, up until 1931, Ukrainian literature continued to develop and the literary disputes, often over minor points of literature, thought and culture, animated society and lent a zest to the various writings. These now more than ever began to reflect a growing apprehension over the conditions as they were and the impossibility of equating the ideals of Communism and the realities of the Russian domination of the country.

[656] A more decided blow was given by the decree of April 23, 1932. This ended all literary discussions and abolished all literary societies and groups throughout the entire Soviet Union. In place of these, Stalin announced the establishment of a single society throughout the entire Union, the All-Union Association of Soviet Writers, and turned this over to Maksim Gorky, perhaps the most prominent

5: Manning S-4 (no date) 1953 RD1 Ukraine RD1

Russian writer of the day but a man who was bitterly anti-Ukrainian and scornful of the national cultures of all the Soviet Republics. His object seems to have been in Ukraine to force the literature to accept the Russian pattern. The new doctrine of socialist realism was promulgated and it was very soon made clear that the destruction of the VUSPP and all the old groups was not a step toward the restoration of freedom for creation but a new move to strengthen, on a somewhat different basis, the government's control over everything that was published.

It was highly significant for this that at the early meetings of the Ukrainian Section, its organizer, I. Kulyk, appeared in the uniform of a frontier guard of the NKVD as a silent warning to all of those who might be regarded as heretical in any sense. Furthermore Zhdanov as a member of the Politburo of the All-Union Communist Party, explained the situation. In his keynote speech, he declared:

"Comrade Stalin has called our writers engineers of human souls. What does that mean? What obligations does it lay upon them? It means first that they must know life, so as to represent it faithfully in artistic works, to represent it not scholastically or in a dead way, not simply as an objective realism but to picture reality in its revolutionary development. In this the truth and historical concreteness of artistic representation must coincide with the tasks of the ideal reworking and development of the working people in the spirit of socialism. This method of artistic literature and of literary criticism are what we call the method of socialist realism."

Whatever might have been the effect of the new organization on Russian literature, which had been handicapped by the domination of the RAPP, its effect on Ukrainian literature could not fail to be disastrous. In effect, it standardized all literature on the Russian model and it indicated that henceforth literature and literary men were to be treated as organs of the Communist Party and of the Moscow regime. It was the definite answer to the efforts of the Ukrainian writers of nearly all the conflicting schools to adapt literature to their own purposes and ideals. It took away from the writers all inspiration and desire to use their talents for their own

626 538 artistic enjoyment and it rendered it possible for the central government to abolish that sense of republican patriotism which had been so marked during the preceding period in all the non-Russian republics.

626 538 178 In place of the ideas of the old Ukrainian life which was being brought to an end by the compulsory collectivization and the establishment of the collective farms, in place of the old visions of the unity of the Ukrainian people and those ideals of a new national life that had dominated Ukrainian literature from the time of Shevchenko, in place of the efforts to establish in Ukrainian literature all those branches of art and culture which were stirring in Western Europe, there was now given to the writers, young and old, the command to celebrate and to glorify the actual process of socialist construction in Ukraine, as elsewhere. By 1934 Kulyk, as the organizer of the Ukrainian section, could write of the definite end of the old bourgeois nationalist sentiment as preached by Yefremiv and of the efforts of Khvylovy to reorient the psychology of Ukrainian literature on that of Europe. In his article on the modern Ukrainian literature in a volume on the *Literature of the Peoples of the USSR* published in 1934, he could pass over in silence, for obvious reasons, all of the great names which had appeared during the preceding ten years and shower his praise upon the young proletarian writers who were willing to follow blindly and, to the best of their ability, the new course.

There were, of course, some of the older and even of the more prominent men who were willing to compromise with the new regime. Among them the outstanding figures were Tychyna and Rylsky. Both of them, after consideration and treatment by the authorities, tried to bend their works to the new ideas but there were many who were unwilling or unable to be untrue to their artistic faith and for them there was not even the choice of silence or writing. They were compelled to conform or vanish and it was not long after the organization of the All-Union Society of Soviet Writers when this was made abundantly clear.

basis with Ukrainian. He established Russian theatres in the larger cities and sent them Russian companies from Leningrad and Moscow to show the greatness of Russian art, while at the same time he had Les Kurbas arrested at the end of the year and closed the Berezil Theatre, the leading company in Ukraine, and even abolished its name as Catherine the Great had abolished the name of the Zaporozhian Sich one hundred fifty years before.

The fundamental object was to re-Russianize Ukraine as rapidly as possible. In pursuance of this idea, Zatonsky even suggested that the students should be encouraged to talk a mixture of Russian and Ukrainian in the hope that they could thus be more quickly induced to accept the alien tongue. That was a rash thought, for as soon as it was reported to Moscow, there came a strong protest from Gorky that such a procedure could only injure the purity of the Russian language by mixing foreign elements in it. Zatonsky hurriedly withdrew his suggestions but it was too late and only a few years later he was to pay the penalty for his rash proposal.

It was small wonder that Khvylovy, who knew well that he was threatened with arrest and execution, committed suicide in despair on May 13, 1933 and he was followed on July 6, by Skrypnyk who was too familiar with the workings of Russian Communism not to realize that he would be steadily demoted until he could be finished off without comment as a fallen idol.

The terror and the destruction proceeded apace and after the murder of Kirov in Leningrad on December 21, 1934, new investigations were ordered and it was discovered that the bulk of the Ukrainian authors were involved in the conspiracy. In a very short time their ranks were almost completely decimated. In the same month H. Kosynka, O. Vlyzko, I. Krushelnytsky, K. Burevy, and D. Falkivsky were shot on various pretenses. Nearly all the former members of the *Vaplite,* the Neo-Classicists, the groups connected with the MARS in Kiev and the *New Generation,* were liquidated in one way or another, either by execution or deportation and deportation was practically the equivalent of death, for scarcely one of the deported ever returned to the Ukraine or made

[reference to forced Russification of Ukraine, 1933 - Analyst]

661 his presence or his present place of dwelling known to any of his
538 friends.

It would be too long to mention the list of names, but among them were all the outstanding names of the preceding years, Kulish, Yalovy, Yohansen, Epik, Zerov, Dray-Khmara, Kosynka, Pidmohylny, Semenko, Vuzko, etc. These men were not only put out of the way but every attempt was made to prove that they had never existed. Their books were removed from the libraries and bookstores and, so far as possible, even references to them and their work were expunged from encyclopedias and reference books and the movement which they represented and which, but a short time before, had been patronized by the Commissariat of Education was rendered non-existent. Only the name of Khvylovy remained as an example of anti-Russian work and he was presented as a pupil of Petlyura, Hrushevsky and the Western imperialists and a believer in bourgeois nationalism, a term which was now extended to cover anything hostile to the general line of the Party.

626 Faced with the certainty of sharing the fate of their colleagues, 1
538 some of even the more prominent authors began to waver. Among this number were Tychyna and, a little more reluctantly, Rylsky. In fact, it required a term in prison to bring the latter to an appreciation of the beauties of the new order. Both proved themselves valuable converts, even if they were compelled to forget all their old mannerisms and perfections of style and produce tasteless propaganda poetry, while the official organs boasted of their slow but steady growth in realism. Thus, in 1934 Kulyk could say of Tychyna, "The collection of *The Party Leads* represents an unquestionable achievement. Nevertheless we should be rendering poor service to Tychyna himself if we failed to point out the uneven tenor, and sometimes even hesitation, in the artistic expression of themes and ideas new to him. Stronger organizational ties with the realities, emancipation from artificial, at times purely bookish culture, such are the conditions on which depends further progress by Tychyna along the new road chosen by this great Ukrainian poet." Rylsky and Bazhan were treated in the same way, while such writers as Panch and Holovko were told it was their task to get over the

1 [Persecution during Russification of Ukraine, 1933 -- Analyst

old notion that "Mother Ukraine" had the same interest in all her sons, whether they were working men, peasants or intellectual nationalists. Both of them later revised their works under the kind leadership of the Party. 626 538

The proletarian writers and those who were content to write upon the prescribed or recommended themes were in their element. Kyrylenko and Mykytenko wrote glowingly and woodenly about collectivization and the elimination of the kulaks, "the dregs of society." Korniychuk, a young dramatist, presented in his plays all the appropriate Five Year plan subjects and gloried in the defeat of the old in the factories and on the collective farms. Everything in the literary field that glorified the Communist Party and rejected those ideas which had flourished under the preceding regime was applauded and the successful received honors and wealth and Stalin prizes for literary achievement.

The same development or retrogression[1] was to be noted in the more purely scientific fields, especially where they touched studies dealing with the Ukrainian language, history or culture. Skrypnyk had removed some of the more distinguished members of the Academy of Science. Postyshev purged most of their followers and then he went on to reorganize the institution in the Communist way. The Academy was changed into a series of separate institutes, each of which was subject only to a carefully chosen Presidium. 626 814

Then, at the end of 1934 all of those institutes connected with the old Historical Section and which dealt with such subjects as Ukrainian archaeology, history, history of law, Western Ukraine, etc. were abolished. The study of the humanities was practically ended and the old staff was excluded. There were left only institutes of language and material culture to care for the past and all other subjects were handed over to the network of the VUAMLIN, the reorganized and strengthened network of Marxo-Leninist institutes, which could serve as a more reliable means of spreading Communist doctrine in a pseudo-scientific form. They created a new complex of societies as the Society of Marxist Historians, all of which had the avowed purpose of glorifying the regime at the expense of any form of scientific truth.

[1] [1933 -- Analyst]

Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Lyubchenko, who had been appointed the Prime Minister of the UkSSR on the single program of suppressing Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, was called to Moscow to confront the self-confessed leaders of the nationalists and, on his return to Kiev, he shot himself. His successor, Bondarenko, disappeared without a trace.

Who were these self-confessed leaders? Prominent among them was A. Khvylya, who had been the champion of the general line against Khvylovy and Skrypnyk and who had been the dominant figure in the attack on the Ukrainian literary men and scholars. For years he had resorted to all kinds of attacks to bring Ukrainian grammar and language closer to Russian. He now "voluntarily" confessed that he had worked against the "elder brother" and had joined and aided in developing a secret military force several million strong for the sole purpose of separating Ukraine from the USSR and he swore that in this he had the active aid of Lyubchenko and most of the officials of the UkSSR. Finis.

Zatonsky, the Commissar of Education, was accused of another crime. He had drawn years before the fire of Gorky for suggesting that a mixed language be introduced into Ukrainian schools as the means of absorbing Ukrainian into Russian. He had speedily withdrawn his recommendations under fire and all had seemed forgiven. It was not, and Zatonsky disappeared in the holocaust.

It then came the turn of the writers. Men like Kulyk, who had run roughshod over the older writers and had called for their liquidation, were now found guilty of bourgeois nationalism and with them most of the authors who had emerged during the shattering of the Ukrainian renaissance and who had celebrated the turning of the Ukraine into a collectivized and industrialized state. Each and every one of them confessed that they had been guilty of bourgeois nationalism and they received the due reward for their crimes.

There was hardly a family in Ukraine which did not suffer the accusation of at least one member. The survivors who have escaped abroad have given lurid tales of the extent to which the feeling of distrust and suspicion spread among all classes of the

626 814 661 sian patriot for signing the Treaty of Pereyaslav and bringing the Zaporozhian Kozaks under Muscovite domination. It was so in every branch of historical study. In back of the conception of the Soviet man and Soviet patriotism began to emerge with ever greater clarity the conception of Russian patriotism, as the doctrine of the "elder brother" who had given culture and civilization to the other nations of the Soviet Union became clearer and clearer.

626 814 191 It was the same thing in language. Khvylya and his friends had been working on a Ukrainian-Russian dictionary but this was immediately criticized by *Pravda* for its divisive tendencies, and the guilty compilers were liquidated. A new edition was started in 1938 on still a new principle. The Ukrainian and Russian words were to have the same number of synonyms and these were to have identical value. If, in any particular case, this did not prove to be true, it was so much the worse for the Ukrainian. If there were more words in Ukrainian to express various shades of one idea that there were in Russian, the words were banned. If there were fewer, the Russian words were supplied in order to show the influence that Russian had had upon the cultural development of Ukrainian.

The result was the reverse of what Zatonsky had proposed. He had suggested a mixed language with the idea that the Ukrainians would develop by practice toward the use of standard Russian. Now the new Commissariat of Education was introducing Russian into Ukrainian, forbidding the use of Ukrainian syntactical constructions which had no parallel in Russian in order to train the Ukrainians to speak Russian by infiltrating it into their native speech. The result would have been perhaps the same, but the important difference was that it preserved the supremacy of the Russian language in a pure form and corrupted the Ukrainian beyond recognition.

●538 191 626 This procedure was too violent, even for many of the poets and writers who were most ardent in their support of the Stalinist regime. Men like Bazhan, who had put his pen entirely at the disposal of Moscow, continued to use some of the forbidden words and even obtained rewards for their obsequious phrases couched in

this taboo language. It was necessary if the whole theory of the USSR was not to fall by the wayside and the authorities in Moscow were becoming aware of the growing danger of Nazism.

They encouraged the writers, as Tychyna and Rylsky, to write narrative and other poems on themes of the old hostility of the Ukrainians to the Polish nobles and to stress the assistance which, in those ancient days, the Ukrainians had received from the Muscovite authorities. They fanned again the fires of the civil war when the Ukrainian Communists, backed by their Muscovite friends and masters, were warring against the Ukrainian National Republic and Petlyura.

In fact, during these fantastic years, Tychyna, Rylsky, Yanovsky and similar writers, as well as Korniychuk, found it easier to maintain their freedom by this fanning of Ukrainian chauvinism into flame than did those authors who, following the narrow interpretation of socialist realism, sought to trace the transformations in the contemporary life and the growth of confidence in the Russian ideas of industrialization and collectivization. Again and again these men were called to account for allowing their local and national sympathies to run away with them and to include descriptions which were perhaps nostalgic but which could be twisted in the perverse logic of the NKVD into hidden criticisms of the great Stalin, the leaders of the people, and the all-wise and beneficent rule of Moscow.

By 1939, the situation in the Ukraine had changed entirely from what it had been in 1929 when the first five year plan was getting under way. The salient features of the Ukrainian economic life had been destroyed. Yet Moscow was not yet satisfied.

Despite the increased taxation and the reduction in the income of the average dweller on a collective farm, the Communist Party demanded each year a larger part of the grain and of the cash income. The voluntary donations for the benefit of the armed forces were increased and steps were begun to demand taxes in kind from the returns which the peasants received from their individual plots. Thus a peasant was required to contribute so many eggs per year to the government, which did not concern itself as to

The libraries were carefully purged of
those authors who had fallen under the displeasure of Moscow 538
during the crushing of the Ukrainian renaissance and their works 626
were forbidden, just as in Eastern Ukraine. The books that were sent from Kiev were chiefly in Russian. Furthermore, those authors, poets, and artists who were still in Western Ukraine now found themselves regimented. They were given elaborate projects but they found that their success depended upon their ability not to express themselves freely but to satisfy the demands of the Soviet authorities. As a result many of them endeavored to get, in one way or another, to the west where even if they were under Nazi rule they still had more possibilities at the time than they did under the highly organized system sponsored by Moscow.

It was thus abundantly evident that the "liberation" of Western 661
Ukraine was but the exchange of one master for a still sterner rule. The realization of this fact came quickly and it very soon evoked a corresponding reaction which began to unite the entire population, the more so as even those few Communists in Western Ukraine who had remained true to their convictions were now seized by the Soviet authorities and punished on the ground that they were Trotskyists or were believers in one of the various deviations from the general line of the party. There were to be no Communists except those who had passed through the Soviet training school and those people who had believed that their Communist faith would be of profit to them found themselves in as wretched a position as had Eastern Ukrainian Communists like Khvylovy and Skrypnyk who had gained nothing by their independence, except death and destruction.

Thus, by the spring of 1941 conditions in Western Ukraine were rapidly assuming the same form that they had taken in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Any hopes that there would be any exception or any toleration for the area were once and for all annihilated when the Soviets attacked Finland and, still more, when, in the summer of 1940, they absorbed and turned into Soviet Republics the three Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The Soviets were shown clearly to be on the march and it was for the people to protect themselves as best they could.

Inasmuch as all the land was organized in collective farms and the title to these rested in the Soviet government, they as conquerors merely took over the land of their defeated rivals. They continued the same kind of collectivized agriculture, since it brought them the greatest advantages and they had no intention of doing anything for the Ukrainian population. Koch made it clear that the Ukrainians had no rights that the Germans were bound to respect. Their property was not theirs but it was reserved for Germans and once the system was in the saddle, as shown by Koch's Twelve Commandments for the regulation of the relations of the two peoples, he did everything to destroy completely the Ukrainian intellectual life.

By the winter of 1941-2, the Germans in Kiev were executing Ukrainian writers as O. Teliha and Dr. Oleh Kandyba-Olzhych, who were accused of plotting against the new masters. Soon there began extensive deportations of Ukrainians to Germany for slave labor and the number of victims from the ranks of the cooperatives rapidly grew.

These German actions naturally roused the Ukrainians to a more vigorous opposition and resulted in the formation of numerous armed bands which, from secure hiding places in the forests and swamps, raided German convoys and at times extended their open control over large areas of the country. Among the first of these bands to appear was that of the Polyssian Sich under the command of Taras Bulba—Borovets which operated in Polissya and Volynia. Other significant and important movements were started by the followers of Bandera (the so-called Banderivtsy) and of Melnyk. Yet these groups were not alone for almost spontaneously there sprang up many other local units, all interested in the same goal of Ukrainian independence. Some of these units were organized primarily to fight against Soviet irregulars. Others had seen from the beginning their most dangerous foe as the Germans but whatever their origin, the overbearing brutality of the Germans swung these groups to a determined warfare against them.

This process continued during most of 1942 with the Ukrainian forces taking over more and more control from the Germans,

5: Manning S-4 (no date) 1953 RD1 Ukraine RD1

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

Soviet Ukraine During World War II

In the preceding chapters we have briefly traced the efforts of the Ukrainians to profit by the clash between the two totalitarian powers of Germany and the USSR and the Ukrainian hopes of being recognized as an independent state. These hopes had been thwarted by the Nazi refusal to treat the Ukraine as anything except a field for German expansion and the Western refusal to recognize the Ukrainian struggle for independence.

This, of course, does not tell the entire story. From the earliest days of the Soviet occupation of Western Ukraine, many of the leading Ukrainian patriots, writers, artists and scholars, including a large part of the staff of the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv, had seized the opportunity to retire to the west into the Polish Government General but there were many more who were picked up in the early deportations and deposited along with the Poles in Central Asia. Some of these, during the brief period of friendship between the Poles and the Soviets, were again able to make their way to the west along with General Anders and found themselves again at freedom, while those who had retired to the west were forced to undergo increasing persecution at the hands of the Nazis as these became more desperate.

On the other hand, when the break finally came in 1941 and the Ukrainians, including those mobilized in the Red Army, began to surrender in masses, the Soviets began to deport to the east all of the outstanding people on whom they could lay their hands and whom at the first moment they did not wish to exterminate. In this number there were such Ukrainian writers as Tychyna, Rylsky and others who had showed their loyalty to the regime by their tasteless flattery of the regime in Moscow.

Under such conditions, if the chaos and the disorder were not 722
to be allowed to spread further, it was obvious that something had to be done to improve the morale of the population. This was particularly evident and necessary during the early months when it seemed as if the Nazis might decide to make some concessions to the people. As a result, there were a series of developments undertaken which superficially, at least, offered some concessions to the spirit of the various non-Russian nationalities.

Thus, in 1943 the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR was [814]
allowed to celebrate its twenty fifth anniversary at Ufa in the Bashkir Autonomous Republic and to list its institutes which were scattered throughout Asia. Such an event rendered it possible to blame the Nazis for the destruction of what had not been evacuated. It furnished good propaganda for the Western powers who were already sending copious supplies to the USSR and receiving in return from it only condemnation and criticism.

In the same way, the various writers who had passed the 732
approval of the government were assigned posts as newspaper 538
correspondents in the Red Army where they could sing the praises 626
of Stalin. Yet, at the same time, they were encouraged to write articles and poems which would reflect the hostility to the Nazis and again and again the censorship was relaxed for men like Sosyura to write poems in praise of the Ukraine, of its past, its present and its future.

Others like Yanovsky and Bazhan were allowed to emphasize [198]
the separation between the traditional Ukrainian speech and the [814]
jargon that had been put out in the various Ukrainian-Russian dictionaries after the breaking of the Ukrainian Renaissance. They were allowed to assemble collaborators to compile a more conservative dictionary and to revamp the system of orthography which had been the work of such pronounced Russian sympathizers as Khvylya during the preceding period.

Yet, these concessions were more apparent than real, for under 722
the wartime conditions, those Ukrainian scholars that had the 814
apparent confidence of the government were scattered far and wide. They were living perforce under abnormal conditions and

000 in an ideal organization. Stalin, by his policy in the thirties, blew away that mirage but it required a World War for him to annihilate it.

Soon after the Germans attacked, Stalin dissolved the Comintern to please his Western allies and to dupe them. He substituted the Slav Congress and when he secured the assent of the Big Three to liberate the Slavs, he highly developed this.

186 As the Red Army, now transformed by fiat of the Council of
728 Commissars of the USSR into the Ukrainian and Byelorussian armies, "liberated" one Slav capital after another, they were followed by cultural missions who talked to the enthusiastic multitudes on the Slav Brotherhood of Nations in terms of 1848, Peter, the Third Rome and Stalin. Rylsky and Tychyna, Korniychuk and Yanovsky, all the outstanding Ukrainian writers who had yielded to the Russian cause and survived the purges, spoke. They praised the new situation and the democratic powers admired this.

665 It was only a sham because soon there was established the Cominform. Its seat was not in Moscow but its spirit was there. The object of the Cominform was not to create a new and equal gathering of Communist humanity, not the ostensible idea of the Comintern but it was to inform the Communists among the Slavs and elsewhere of the approach to Communism by the elder Communists of the world, the Muscovite Great Russians.

● [538] In the purely cultural sphere the answer was the condemnation of formalism, and still more of internationalism. Formalism was a technical school of literary criticism which had contributed something to the study of literature and culture. It was an attempt to put technique above content, or rather to judge content by technique and its advocates, sometimes great scholars in a narrow field, basked in the light of the admiration of their friends, until they considered themselves great.

814 Internationalism was something else. Its content had been ex-
665 pressed by the Protopope Avvakum in 1666 when he announced at his trial in Moscow that all Orthodox Christians had to come to Moscow to learn. Now it was the same. History was to be periodicized between A. M. and P. M. (Ante Muscoviae and Post

Muscoviam, Before and After Moscow). If the before was leading up to a Moscow discovery, it was good; if not, it was bad. 814 665

This was proclaimed by Zhdanov of the Politbiuro in 1946 when, under the highest auspices, he began his attack. On September 4 of that year, at a meeting of the Umiom of Soviet Writers in Moscow, he lashed out at various films which had been recently produced and at several Russian authors, especially Zoshchenko and Anna Akhmatova, for not producing a true picture of Soviet reality. Then, warming to his task, he explicitly declared that literature had to be entirely at the service of the Communist Party and that it was the duty of every Soviet writer to lash and scourge the decadent bourgeois west. He berated many of the authors for wishing to learn from the bourgeois writers at the very moment when Soviet literature, the most revolutionary literature in the world, was a hundred times higher and more beautiful than the literature of the bourgeois west. [546] 538 626 665

The speech of Zhdanov was the open proclamation of war against all foreign influences in Soviet literature and it was directed against some of the most respected figures, who were apparently silenced. Even Tikhonov was removed from his post at the head of the Union of Soviet Writers for not having exerted himself more strongly against these dangerous heresies. [558]

Yet this speech was not really the beginning, for some weeks before the question was fully brought into the open, at a meeting of the KP/b/U, Khrushchov, the Russian who held the post as First Secretary of the KP/b/U, had received from the Executive Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow full and definite instructions as to the means to be adopted for purging Ukrainian literature and science and for suppressing all traces of bourgeois nationalism. His remarks were reprinted in part by *Pravda* in Moscow, which summarized them in these words.

"The TsK KP/b/U had not paid sufficient attention to ideological work, does not give enough weight to the selecting and the ideological and political education of the cadres in the fields of science, literature and art, has not organized in the press a wide criticism of the hostile bourgeois-nationalist ideology. As a result

538 626 665 in some books, journals and newspaper articles and in the lectures of some Ukrainian historians and literary men there are ideological mistakes and perversions, and efforts to revive the bourgeois nationalist conceptions of the historian Hrushevsky and his 'school.'"

[814] 538 626 The weight of the attack fell upon the Institute of Language and Literature of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR for two books which it had published. One was the first volume of a *History of Ukraine* which had appeared in 1943 and the other was *An Outline of the History of Ukrainian Literature* which had appeared in 1945. The authors of both books were accused of having failed to periodicize Ukrainian history and literature according to the Marxo-Leninist tradition and of having followed Hrushevsky and Yefremiv in being deceived by external political events. They were charged with remarks that could be interpreted as maintaining an early separation of Ukrainian culture from Russian, when it was a fact that the three brotherly nations, the Great Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians, had had a joint culture until the fourteenth century, after which the Great Russians became the truest heirs and interpreters of the whole. They were charged with idealizing the old bourgeois nationalists as V. Naumenko and O. Levytsky, of admiring the old state of patriarchal private property and of failing to realize the great ideological gulf between Shevchenko, who stood in the tradition of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, etc., and Kulish who was a liberal and not a revolutionist. They were condemned for having a good word for such nationalist counter-revolutionists as Vynnychenko and Oles and for calling a competent poet, I. Steshchenko, who had been a minister under Petlyura. They forced their own flatterer, Rylsky, to leave his post as head of the Union of Soviet Writers of the Ukraine for not having taken a sufficiently firm stand in condemning the mistakes of the other writers, and for a while he was in disfavor.

The accusations penned in Moscow and printed in *Pravda* and the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* were reprinted in the Ukrainian papers with even more vulgarity and abuse. They poured out their venom at nearly all the writers and historians who regarded the use of the Ukrainian language as expressing the feelings and the

culture of the Ukrainian people. They condemned nationalist praise of Kotlyarevsky for introducing national pride and feeling into his *Eneida,* the first book in the Ukrainian vernacular published in 1798. They accused the writers and scholars of deliberately trying to drive a wedge between the Russian and Ukrainian people and of refusing to see, because of their bourgeois nationalist prejudices, that the great Ukrainian writers of the nineteenth century had always drawn their inspiration and been close to the progressive Russian writers, as Belinsky and Chernyshevsky, and they denied the existence of any Western European influence on Ukrainian literature, since all the influence had come from the Russians. They found influences of Gorky on Lesya Ukrainka and cited as her models Russian works which appeared after her works were in print. All this made no difference, for the Marxo-Leninists were in sole possession of the truth and their word was law.

Stalin had declared that the new Soviet literature and culture was to be Communist in content and national in form but it was very soon realized that even this was to be interpreted in a special sense. Any excessive attention paid by writers to descriptions of the Ukrainian landscape which did not bring a glorification of the new factories was treated as an antiquated sympathy with the old patriarchal Ukraine and its bourgeois nationalism. Any mention of the Zaporozhian Sich and the Kozak past, unless it was connected very definitely with the union and longing of the Kozaks for Muscovite rule, was declared to be treasonable and bourgeois nationalist in essence. Thus, step by step the authorities in Moscow and their mouthpieces in Ukraine limited more and more closely the possibility of describing or singing of any of the characteristic features of Ukrainian life and the historic past, while the Great Russians were given free rein to glorify the past of Russia even under the tsars, for it was there that the seeds of the Communist Party were planted and flourished.

This process of tracking down bourgeois nationalism perhaps reached the limits of its absurdity in 1951 when the Soviet critics discovered dangerous thoughts in the war poem of Volodymyr Sosyura, *Love Ukraine.* It was a graceful, but hardly a great poem.

538 626 It had been enthusiastically received in 1944, when it appeared, and the poet was awarded for it a Stalin Prize. The poem was published and republished by the state publishing houses and then it was suddenly discovered that it was untrue, bourgeois nationalist, etc. and the unfortunate author was forced to repent of his errors. As a matter of fact, even before this, many of the Russian translators had gone out of their way to insert in it various passages celebrating the Volga and the Kremlin as part of the love of Ukraine, but they, too, were reprimanded for trying to improve the work instead of condemning it for its real quality.

In every field of scholarship, literature, art, and music, the same charges have been brought with logical consistency. Anything which would remind the readers of the old pre-Communist life is treated as dangerous, but none of the authors, no matter how they have falsified history or the present, has been able to express the great achievements of the new Soviet Ukraine and to catch its spirit and show how it can in any degree differ from Moscow. At the first sign of any independent judgment, the cry is raised of bourgeois nationalism and the work is suppressed.

545 532 626 At the same time the Ukrainian scene is being overloaded with things Russian. Russian theatrical companies are continually travelling around the republic so as to show the real charity and achievements of the elder brother and inspire a desire for imitation of its life and thought under that all-time world genius, Joseph Stalin. Russian musical ensembles and exhibitions of the works of Russian artists are constantly sent to all the chief cities of the non-Russian republics, not only to acquaint the people with Russian achievements but still more to give them the necessary patterns by which they should plan their lives and work.

538 626 There are constantly published masses of Ukrainian translations of Russian works and books translated from the other languages used in the USSR and it is almost essential for an author to allude to these and especially to the Georgian people as the people of Stalin, if he wishes to avoid the charge of bourgeois nationalism and the attempt to sow hostility between the brotherly peoples.

000 The situation is even more severe in the field of language.

The Soviet Cultural Policy in the Ukraine After the War

The situation is even more severe in the field of language. 191
Korniychuk after World War II emphasized that Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism was not to be sought only by a consideration of the contents of books and paintings. It was reflected in a still more dangerous form in the language of the books themselves. Any author who showed a predilection for the use of the older forms of the language or sought to develop it in any way other than the Communist Party desired was thereby convicting himself of holding nationalistic sentiments and of being dangerously reactionary. He thus accused of bourgeois nationalism even those writers as Yanovsky who had been most rigorous in following the party line in content.

The real significance of this statement of Korniychuk's is shown by the *Ukrainian-Russian Dictionary* which finally appeared in 1948 under the editorship of L. A. Bulakhovsky and M. F. Rylsky. The work was published in Moscow, although it bore the stamp of the Institute of Language Study of the Academy of Sciences of the UkSSR.

In this the authors made no concealment of their program, for they definitely stated that their work was based upon the "spoken" Ukrainian of the government offices (where it was the most corrupted by Russian words), and not the older Ukrainian language as spoken before the introduction of the Bolshevik reforms. They added, too, that they had supplied from Russian whatever was lacking in Ukrainian, for "thanks to the Russian language, the Ukrainian has been able to acquire the capacity to respond to the needs of socialist construction and to satisfy the cultural needs of the Ukrainian people."

Stripped of its Communist jargon, this passage merely means that the Moscow authorities have decided to carry on their policy of russification in a new way. They have recognized the gap between the older Ukrainian language and the hodgepodge which they have produced and they are now insisting on using the words of the older usage in their most narrow and restricted sense, and by refusing to recognize any possibility of development in Ukrainian or any changes in it, they are forcing Ukrainian to become a dead language and by an inverted purism are planning to compel

191 626 538

191 626 814

[198]

191 the Ukrainians to recognize that Russian and Russian alone is in
626 a position to grow and develop.
814 This is entirely in line with the new philological policy dictated by Stalin after his repudiation of the late Prof. Marr and what was commonly known as Marrism, a theory that Stalin had sponsored for many years. Now he was willing to argue that Russian as the language of the USSR was not only the Russian language as the language of the Russian people but it was also in a new sense a zonal language, the approved language of Socialism and Communism and, as such, it had already absorbed all that it needed and its mission was to replace all those languages which were spoken by people who had awaked to the truth of the Moscow doctrines.

626 Thus the new theories of language study that were officially
814 accepted in Moscow opened new vistas for cultural oppression and perversion of the Ukrainian masses. They were a signal for renewed efforts, not only to control the Ukrainian cultural life in the present and the future but their efforts were extended to the past and the scholars were set to carry out an artificial restatement of Ukrainian history, literature and culture from the earliest known periods.

538 It is small wonder then that the modern post-war Ukrainian
626 literature is becoming more and more a pallid and bloodless imitation of the stereotyped patterns required for Great Russian and that even those authors who have sold themselves to the Stalinist regime are unable to produce anything of real value or of even mediocre excellence. They are turning out the average propaganda material against the imperialistic Americans on the lines ordered by the Politiburo with never a thought except the income and perquisites which they are slated to receive and the constant terror lest at some moment by an unfortunate slip they may be accused justly or unjustly of that terrible crime of bourgeois nationalism and lose in an instant all that they have worked for years to win.

The cultural pressure exerted on eastern Ukraine is spread likewise with even more force over those portions in the West which had been formerly under Poland or Czechoslovakia. Here, as former parts of the old Hapsburg monarchy, the writers had had

more opportunity to absorb the current thought of the west than they had had in eastern Ukraine. Therefore, the pressure against them has been applied even more strongly and still more Russians have been sent to remodel the life in Lviv than was necessary for Kiev. The process of russification was started later but it has been pushed more energetically. The net result is the same,—the impoverishment of Ukrainian culture as a whole and the substitution for it of a shabby form of Russian Muscovite Communist culture, which is to be tolerated only until there can be a full absorption.

Yet that process has not been so easy. Hardly a week passes that some of the higher units in the Soviet service do not discover a new nest of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, and most frequently among the members and officers of the KP/b/U. It has been made evident that the Russian Communists cannot hope to achieve their goal until they have eliminated the entire Ukrainian population. They are trying to do it, but despite the millions of their victims and their attempts to separate the Ukrainian children from their parents and to rear them as slaves for Russian factories, they have not succeeded in winning the population to their views.

From the cultural point of view, the post-war period has been even more depressing than were the thirties. It has been drabber, like the lives of the people, but it has not served as yet to eliminate that spark of hope which alone preserved the Ukrainians during the hard periods of tsarism when they were subjects and slaves on their own territories, which were not their own to govern or to develop.

p. 3

I. THE EMERGENCE OF NATIONALISM

727 DURING the summer and autumn of 1941 the German armies rolled across the plains of the Ukraine; by November the entire Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was in their hands. Observers everywhere were aware of the significance of the conquest of [241] this huge area with its thirty-five million inhabitants. The agricultural wealth of the Ukraine, famous as the "granary of the USSR," the gigantic industrial complex of the Donets basin, and the rich mineral deposits were weighed in appraising the loss of the Soviet Union and the gain of Germany. While the political effects of the conquest received less attention at the time, in some ways they were even more important than the economic effects.

186 While there is a tradition of separate political development in the Ukraine,[1] modern nationalism—the doctrine that persons of a distinctive culture should constitute an independent state—came late to the area. To a close observer, the first stirrings of nationalism among educated groups in the Ukraine would have been apparent early in the nineteenth century, and by the middle ● [538] of that century Taras Shevchenko, the greatest name in Ukrainian literature, was giving poetic expression to nationalist aspirations. It was considerably later, however, that definitely political [668*] organizations were formed to establish the claim of the Ukraine to nationhood.[2] For the student of contemporary politics, it is precisely this late emergence of Ukrainian nationalism which

[1] The term "Ukraine" is used throughout this study (except in cases when another meaning is clearly implied) to refer to the territory comprised in the Ukrainian SSR in 1945. Essentially the same area (with the exception of the Carpatho-Ukraine, which is discussed briefly at several points in this study) was included in the Ukrainian SSR in 1941. This territory corresponds fairly closely—except, as noted in Chapter XI, in the east—to the Ukrainian "ethnographical" territory, the area in which the indigenous population speaks Ukrainian.

[2] John S. Reshetar, *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920: A Study in Nationalism* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 12.

6: Armstrong S-4 (no date) 1955 RD1 Ukraine RD1

Fundamentally, though, it is not to the criteria of religion, folkways, or language that the adherents of Ukrainian nationalism have appealed; more basic has been the evocation of a common historical tradition, the claim that the Ukrainian people, once great and independent, had lost its heritage. In the Europe of the turn of the century there were, to the superficial observer, two classes of nations, those which were embodied in independent states and those which were not.[9] Actually, the second group was almost as sharply subdivided into the "historic" nations, which had the memory of having possessed within modern times a stable state form, and those which were not so fortunate. Among the former may be mentioned the Poles, whose republic had vanished only a century previously, and the Czechs, who still preserved a vestige of their ancient state in the Crown of Bohemia. For groups like the Latvians, the Slovenes, and the inhabitants of the Ukraine, however, no such obvious rallying points of statehood existed; hence, the pages of history had to be searched to provide a comparable symbol of unity.

Since it was vital to the emerging nation that its language and its history be embodied in works which could inspire loyalty, it was only natural that the leaders of the nationalist movement should have been writers. The national poet Shevchenko has already been mentioned, and he was but one of many writers, such as Nicholas Kostomarov and John Franko. Historians, headed by Michael Hrushevs'kyi, who perhaps more than any other deserves the title of father of Ukrainian nationalism, were equally important.[10] The early leaders of the movement were almost without exception intellectuals—men more at home with words than deeds—a fact which was to have great significance for the future development of Ukrainian nationalism.

Part of the effort to stimulate the historical sense of the people of the Ukraine centers around an endeavor to demonstrate that their ethnic and spiritual ancestor was the people of Kievan "Rus" and to deny that the Russians were descended from the medieval state of Kiev. Much greater energy is devoted, however,

[9] This concept is expressed in Hugh Seton-Watson's *Eastern Europe between the Wars, 1918–1941* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1946), pp. 268–69.
[10] Cf. Reshetar, *The Ukrainian Revolution*, p. 9.

197 Ukrainians, the German and Austrian authorities had to use Russian interpreters instead of Ukrainian ones from Galicia. Trained at the Ukrainian University of Lvov, founded by the Austrian Government, and belonging to another religion, being 'uniats' and non-Orthodox, the Galician men of letters, scientists and politicians who invaded the Ukraine after the Revolution of 1917, appeared as foreigners to the native population.

538 In popular Ukrainian poetry one finds no trace of the epic poem of the Russia of Kiev, of which the 'Tales of the Companions of Igor,' written in a language which was still very close to old Slavonic, is a magnificent example. The epic songs of the flourishing epoch of the State of Kiev, still bearing traces of the mixture of Christian and remnants of old pagan conceptions, have been perpetuated far into the north. They are the *byliny*, songs of St. Vladimir and his companions, which were accompanied by some acting, and which the popular *skazitels* still sing in the most distant North Russian lands in the forests on the shore of the White Sea. In the Ukraine a popular epic poetry of a new kind, based on subjects which have not been published, has appeared, inspired by the Cossack struggles. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have left us a few examples.

This poetry is highly lyrical, noble, and melancholy and has developed especially in the following century. It still lives to our days, known under the name of '*doumy*.' Although it speaks of epic deeds, this poetry is profoundly distinguished by that lyricism which characterizes the whole popular Ukrainian poetic art.

[533] 177 Like all the languages of the Russian family, Ukrainian adapts itself wonderfully to song. It is the Ukraine which has taught the whole of Russia the polyphonic song, which even penetrated to the remotest corners of the Russian land. It is possible that this song itself was early influenced in the Ukraine by certain elements of Western music.

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

nor to beat the superior of a monastery to such an extent that the unfortunate one died a short time after), Mohila was the personification of the reaction against the democracy of the preceding epoch in the bosom of Orthodoxy. When still an Archimandrite of the Monastery of the Caves at Kiev, he established there, at his own expense, a school which was afterwards to become the famous Kiev Academy. It was to Rome that he sent those monks to study who were destined to become the first teachers, and it was from Latin that he translated his *Ritual*, a book which was read throughout Russia. As a result the people of Kiev became disturbed on learning that the teaching of the Academy was that of Latin scholasticism, and that the Latin language occupied a predominant place.

Greek and Latin naturally remained subjects of teaching, but the whole religious literature suffered from the effect of the forms of eloquence which were then being used in the Catholic world.

We know the role which was played by the Academy of Kiev in the development of Imperial Russian civilization, and it was Mohila himself who first proposed, though prematurely, in 1640, to found a school on the Kiev model in Moscow. But the artificial character of the religious literature, of which the Academy was the centre, delayed for long the blossoming of literary genius in the Ukraine.

The current of popular inspiration having been slowed down, that which was printed in the eighteenth century had almost no literary or national value. The famous printing press of the Monastery of Potchaiev, in Western Volynia, generally limited itself to editing the books required for divine service in old Slavonic. Amongst its other publications only the collection of religious poems, the 'Bogoglasnik,' presents some

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

538 interest owing to the traces of popular influences which bring them nearer to the lyrical Ukrainian poetry.

536 It is only in the domain of dramatic art that the national originality could still find expression. For example, the Mysteries and the Fables of the West, the first Ukrainian theatre, is in the beginning the work of clergy who want to edify the people while entertaining them. The students of the Academy of Kiev are its first dramatists, playwrights, and producers. And, just as in the West, it soon loses its serious and strictly religious character. The element of entertainment becomes more and more pronounced. The people acquire a taste for these marionette performances which soon become a truly national amusement. At first they usually represented the Crib of the Nativity and all the events which took place around it. The name of 'Crib' (*vertep*) remained connected with them for ever. But the Madonna and the Child Jesus were soon supplanted by comical characters such as the Devil, the Vagabond Priest, the sly peasant, and the schemer. The social satire, a direct product of popular feeling, became the real purpose of these marionette performances and on holidays and at fairs the people crowded to see them. The Dwarfs Theatre in the Ukraine so pleased the Tsar Alexis of Moscow that he ordered the establishment of 'Comedy Plays' in the theatre of his summer residence, and this despite the protestations, the indignation, and the anathemas of the Muscovite clergy.

538 It is at the end of the eighteenth century that the intellectual and cultural movement in the Ukraine first appears. Ivan Kotliarevsky, considered the 'Father of Ukrainian literature,' called himself 'a simple amateur of the Little Russian tongue.' In reality it is the love of poetic folk-lore which characterizes modern Ukrainian literature, and it is that which labels it among local

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

Russian literatures. It is in this spirit that Kotliarevsky published his comic poem, the *Travesty of Aeneid*, in 1798, the first great Ukrainian literary work, followed by a light comedy, *Natalka Poltavka*, which had a great success in Russia during a century and which is played to-day in all the countries of the Ukrainian language. Under the influence of German romanticism a particular interest arose in the Russian literary world for all that which was connected with the folk-lore, the language, and the customs of the people, as well as for their traditions and their art. Thus the first efforts of Kotliarevsky were well received by the literary circles of St. Petersburg and his *Travesty of Aeneid* remained one of the favourite readings of several Russian generations.

Encouraged by the great Slavophile movement which broke with all exaggerated Westernization, Russian writers turned to all the manifestations of the popular genius and, quite naturally, also to that of the Ukraine.

Just as in the eighteenth century the religious language and culture of Southern Russia had brought about the literary awakening of Moscow, in allowing the Russian language to free itself from its archaic forms, so, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Ukraine, her romantic past, the charm of her nature, and of her popular life, inspired Russian literature and poetry. The same period saw the birth of two Ukrainian geniuses who for ever occupy places of a high order in universal literature: Gogol (1809–52) and Chevtchenko (1814–61). Nicholas Gogol wrote only in Russian, not because he was forced to do so by some exterior factors, or because he ignored Ukrainian, but because the greatness and the diversity of his talent passed beyond the possibilities of expression of the literary Ukrainian language. Despite the picturesqueness and the indisputable richness of its forms, this language never went beyond the literary

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

538 form of popular idiom. Thus, in the domain of literary,
192 scientific, philosophic, and technical vocabulary, it is incomparably less developed than the Russian language. The pictures of town life, of the life of the upper layers of society, which dominated, during the whole of the nineteenth century, as the subject of imaginative writings and particularly of the novel, are not easily expressed in the Ukrainian language. Some expressions and words, necessary for this, are missing. We even take the liberty of expressing the opinion, which may seem bold, that the reading of *Crime and Punishment*, of *War and Peace*, of *Oblomov*, or of *Dead Souls* in Russian would be of greater value to a Ukrainian than the translation of these works into his mother-tongue. Moreover, the translations of these immortal works into other great European languages seem to us to be closer to the form, the contents, and the ideas expressed by them than their translations into the Ukrainian language, which so much resembles Russian. Therefore every work of Gogol belongs, without any doubt, to the Russian literature without being, for this reason, foreign
538 to the Ukrainian world. A traditionalist, profoundly pious, to a point of being irritated by the Russian 'Intelligentsia,' already imbued with positivist ideas, he loved the whole Russia with an ardent and passionate love. He was hurt by the spectacle of desertions and cowardice which characterized the Russian life of his time, of all those open wounds which he was able to distinguish and to depict with an unrivalled sarcasm. Like the Slavophiles and later Dostoievski, he hoped that the salvation would come from the deeper forces dormant in the Orthodox Church and in the Russian Monarchy. The Ukrainian chauvinists of our day sometimes describe him as a renegade, an opinion which it is unnecessary to contradict. One only has to re-read

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

his works consecrated to the Ukraine to feel the love Gogol felt for his native land, for the popular Ukrainian soul, and for her heroic and romantic traditions. Rather let us allow the present-day Ukrainian politician, M. Alexander Shoulgine, to speak, who has written in his book, *The Ukraine against Moscow*, the title of which already indicates his hostility to Russia: 'Could I ever remember without a pang what I felt each time in my childhood, on hearing or reading *The Vigils of the Ukraine* or the history of the tragic struggle of *Taras Boulba*.' And he added that many Ukrainians have confessed to him to the 'awakening of their patriotic feeling' when reading these works. Does not this remark, coming from a convinced separatist, confirm that Russian language suffices to awaken in a Ukrainian his most intimate, most secret passions of the soul? If the Ukrainian language is dear and indispensable to a Ukrainian, he is equally in need of Russian. It opens to him the broader spiritual and intellectual horizons and unites him with the community of great peoples. In this the closeness of Russian and Ukrainian literature gives the Ukrainians a position far superior to that of the small Slavonic nations such as the Slovaks, Serbs, or Slovenes. And the fanatics who make themselves ridiculous by treating Gogol as a renegade, are they not similar to the French Provençals, admirers of the Mistral, who would reproach a Jean Giono for writing in French and not in Provençal?

On the contrary, Taras Chevtchenko, who was considered the model of Ukrainianism, wrote in Southern Ukrainian. Born of a family of serfs and himself a serf in his early youth, he has carried the force of poetic expression of the Ukrainian language to a point which had not been reached before and which has not been equalled since. The sadness of the life of the peasant

7:Bregy & Obolensky II-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

538 serfs, the dreams of past glories, such as they live in the popular songs, are the principal themes of Chevtchenko. We find in them both romanticism and a strong expression of social aspirations. In placing Chevtchenko on the level of the greatest European poets we are obliged to state that the subjects which inspire his poetical works are more limited than those of a Poushkine or a Mickiewicz.

Chevtchenko, the peasant and man of the people, was an instinctive revolutionary in the political sense of the term. He revolts against autocracy and against the lords, and with all his force he appeals for aid for his oppressed brothers and for the struggle for freedom which fascinates him. Though his poetic feeling was high and his lyricism rich, his subjects never go beyond the limited circle of the struggles of the serfs with the lords. One can easily imagine the effect which his poems produced in the circles of the Russian intelligentsia, in which he had been triumphantly received, as they were also dreaming of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

668 538 The Universities of Kharkov and of Kiev, founded by the Imperial Government, one in 1805 and the other in 1834, were the rallying centres of the intellectual movements of Southern Russia. They produced the celebrated historian Kostomarov, who became the spokesman of Liberalism and of the cultural awakening of the Ukraine.

The active enthusiasm of these young intellectuals with revolutionary tendencies led to the creation of a secret society in Kiev, the 'Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius,' which was almost immediately discovered by the police. The conspirators took the road to Siberia. In 1847 Chevtchenko was condemned to seven years of service as a simple soldier in a far-away garrison. This relatively light sentence—followed, it is true, by the prohibition of writing and painting (he was a painter of talent at the same time as a poet)—was

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

imposed on a revolutionary with destructive ideas and not on a nationalist Ukrainian. It is only after the accession of the Emperor Alexander II in 1855, when a more Liberal mood became apparent in Russia, that the deportees of Kiev were able to return to Europe.

Some years later Chevtchenko died. Kostomarov, on the contrary, settled at the University of St. Petersburg where, during long years, he wrote his great historical works. Having become a well-known historian and, with age, more moderate, he nevertheless remained, during the whole of his life, a regionalist patriot of the Ukraine, which he wanted to see included in the framework of a great Russian Federation governed by Liberal principals. Even the Brotherhood of Saints Cyril and Methodius, despite its revolutionary extremism, had had no more than federalist ideas and had never dreamed of the separation of the Ukraine from Russia. This is confirmed by the Ukrainian historian of note, M. E. Borschak, in his interesting study, published in the *Slav World*. He writes that 'the Ukrainian movement was then free of any ideas of separatism, of which we did not find any traces when analysing its ideology.'

Let us repeat again: The struggle, in the Ukraine as in the whole of Russia, was begun in the name of Liberalism and of Social Reform against an existing political and social order, not against Russia in the name of the Ukraine, and in this the Ukrainian movement differed deeply from the national movements of the ethnically non-Russian groups. At the time when thousands of Poles, poor and rich, peasants and aristocrats, socialists or monarchists, were being deported to Siberia for wishing to separate Poland from Russia, *not a single Ukrainian* joined the convoys of political deportees as a partisan of the autonomy or the independence of his country. If thousands of Ukrainians settled in the

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

668 Siberian *taiga*, it was for having been republicans or
538 socialists or for having struggled against Tsarism but not against Russia.

538 Sometimes it is claimed that Chevtchenko was personally hostile to everything Russian. But he seems to have been nothing of the kind. An admirer of the 'noble spirit' of Gogol, Chevtchenko himself wrote his personal diary in Russian and he has left us no less than eleven novels and some poetry written in the same language, of which two poems were written before his exile. By conviction and by temperament a revolutionary, Chevtchenko felt himself intimately united with the opposition circles in Great Russia and belonged, as such, to the great family of Russian men of letters.

[609] On the other hand, always true to the popular feelings and sharing with the Ukrainian peasants the hostility towards the German and particularly towards the estate-owners and the school-teachers, he vituperates, in his *Epistle to Compatriots*, against their subjection to German intellectual and cultural influence. When speaking of his young compatriots he says that they blamed their parents 'as they have not taught them to chatter in German in their childhood.' And Chevtchenko laments that 'Ukraine, such are your sons, your young flowers, watered with ink in the German hothouses.' He equally revolts against the vanity of Ukrainian youth, taught by German scholars of whose infallibility they are convinced:

> 'I have seen everything, I know everything.
> There is no hell nor paradise,
> Nor God:
> There is nought but I,
> And the small angular German,
> And nothing more. This is enough, little brother,
> But what do you represent in reality?
> . . . As the German says: we do not know.'

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

Sometimes these laments bear a character of bitter irony. The pretended infallibility of German opinion concerning the fate and the history of the Ukrainian people exasperates him. 'The German will tell you: You are Mongolians. Yes, Mongolians, nude descendants of Tamerlaine clothed in gold. The German will tell you: You are Slavs. Yes, Slavs, unworthy great-grandsons of glorious ancestors.'

While ironizing about the faithful pupils of the German school he continues: 'They spoke according to German precepts in such a way that the German himself, though a great professor, could understand nothing of it . . . at Sitch the German, full of wisdom, grows the potato and you buy it and eat it for your health and you glorify the Zaporoges . . . but by whose blood has this earth been fertilized to produce the potatoes? . . . Her own children have led the Ukraine to the edge of the precipice, they have crucified her worse than the Poles, they want to teach them, at least they pretend it . . . they want to train this blind old man which is the Ukraine under German influence.' (*Kobzar.*)

For him the German question was not only one of literature since he, his sister, and his two brothers were serfs of the German estate-owner Engelhardt, who was noted for his coarseness and the absence of any culture.

The Liberal era which began in Russia with the accession of Alexander II gave broad satisfaction to the aspirations of the circles of the former opposition. The liberation of the serfs in 1861, the inauguration of municipalities elected by the people, the radical reforms based on the permanence of judges, and the establishment of juries and judicial guarantees, eliminated the major reasons for the old revolutionary leanings. A wide movement of reconciliation began to develop which would probably have benefited the Ukraine as

7:Bregy & Obolensky H-4, 5 (no date) 1940 RD1 Ukraine RD1

668 186 The society of the 'United Slavs' was only one expression of the great liberating movement, and its failure was the logical consequence of the suppression of the Decembrist insurrection at St. Petersburg on 14 December 1825, which gave it its name.

This failure checked for a long time the attempts of political revolt in the whole of Russia. Nevertheless the intellectual movement continued, always inspired by the same sources and the same ideals.

538 The genius of Chevtchenko determined the path which the whole Ukrainian literature was to follow. It clung especially to the description of popular life, of the peasant life with its sadness and its injustices. Deeply steeped in folk-lore, it was especially inspired by the pity of the disinherited, by this social pity which is a feature of its affinity with the great Russian literature. In the writings of Marko Vovtchok (pen-name of Marie Vilinska Markovitch) in the *Popular Tales*, approved by Chevtchenko himself, we find again the touching picture of the peasant miseries. Later, in Galicia, Franko, Martovitch, and Stefanik give some pretty examples of this literature, more social than national. Parallel to this, in Russian Ukraine, this tradition was pursued until the revolution by Kotsiubinsky, Tobilevitch, and, above all, by Lessia Oukrainka, the niece of Michael Dragomanov, to whom we will presently return.

536 545 The Ukrainian Theatre experienced a remarkable development towards the end of the nineteenth century. We have already considered the taste of the Ukrainian people for dramatic art, a taste which had already found expression in the old marionette plays. The rise of the new Ukrainian literature could not fail to bring about the development of a modern theatre. As a result a troupe of Ukrainian actors, that of Kropivnitzky, was formed at Kiev and had a great success. The Imperial

that it was in the interest of Prussia to help the Ukrainian people to cast off the chains of Muscovite slavery. During the Great French Revolution the person of Napoleon was very popular in Ukraine. Ukrainian patriots were pleased by the victories of the French Emperor, and hoped that, after the defeat of Russia in a war with France, the time for the liberation of Ukraine would come, and the odious serfdom would be abolished. But Napoleon had no understanding of the Ukrainian problem. He planned the creation of two states 'Napoléonides' in Ukraine under his protectorate ...*)

Ukrainian history has gone its own way, different from that of Russia. This has created the peculiar national character of the Ukrainians.

The foreigners who had visited Ukraine in the 17th and 18th centuries pointed out the higher level of civilisation among the Ukrainians in comparison with the Russians, and the highly developed feeling of personal dignity of the Ukrainian people. This love of freedom of the Ukrainian people appeared also in the fight against Tsarist absolutism in Russia, where revolutionaries of Ukrainian origin occupied the first places, Zhelyabov, Kybalchych, Konashevych, Osynsky, Kravchynsky (Stepnyak), Popko, and many other members of the party '*Narodnaya Volya*'.

In the 19th century, under the influence of the ideas of that time (the Great French Revolution, romanticism) the regeneration of the so-called unhistorical pepoples (Serbians, Bulgarians, Czechs, Slovaks, Baltic peoples) began; in the beginning it was the interest for the language and history of the peoples among the educated classes, and the attempt to write in the 'common people's' language. In Ukraine the regeneration of the popular literary language began with the publication of the satirical poem of Ivan Kotlyarevsky *Aeneid:* 1798. In this poem the author underlines his dislike of serfdom and the lords

> "who did not give the people freedom
> and treated them like cattle."

Democratic ideas were widespread in Ukraine; the representatives of the Ukrainian educated classes took an active part in the revolutionary organisations directed towards the fall of the Tsarist régime (the uprising of the 'Decabrists', 1825—26, was most active in Ukraine, near Kiev).

In 1846 a Ukrainian political organisation, *The Society of St. Cyrill and Methodius,* was founded in Kiev. Many prominent representatives of Ukrainian culture like Taras Shevchenko (the

*) *Revue des Etudes Napoléoniennes:* Paris 1922.

186 Ukraine, demanded that the Communist Party stopped its policy of
665 Russification of the Ukrainian workers. On May 12, 1926, Shumsky declared at a session of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CP of Ukraine:

"In the Party, the Russian Communists are ruling, who treat the Ukrainian Communists with distrust and enmity".

In a letter to the Central Committee of he CP of Ukraine of February 1927, Shumsky wrote: "The Ukrainian Communist feels himself indeed a stepson of the Party".

[558] For this 'deviation' the top institutions of the Communist Party resolutely condemned Shumsky. He was deprived of his office and sent to Russia.

656 A new 'deviation' was detected in the CP of Ukraine in 1928.
186 The Communist Volobuyev showed in his articles that economi-
687 cally Ukraine was a Russian colony. He demanded for Ukraine the securing of a free economic development. Volobuyev published figures which proved that Ukraine was giving Russia almost 1/3 of her incomes without equivalent. He pointed out that Russia was sending workers from Russia into Ukraine, thus artifically creating a majority of Russian elements in the Ukrainian industrial centres (*The Bolshevik of Ukraine*, No. 3: Kharkov, 1928). Volobuyev was punished alike for this 'nationalist deviation'.

186 In spite of all these difficulties and hindrances created by the
517 Russian Government for the development of Ukrainian culture, the time of 'Ukrainisation' gave some gains for cultural Ukrainian progress, even in the conditions of the Communist dictatorship: Ukrainian shools — elementary, secondary and academic — had been organised; the Ukrainian Academy of Science developed its work extensively. In a few years of cultural work the cadres of a
● [538] new Ukrainian intelligentsia were created. The Ukrainian literary production developed in spite of all obstacles on the part of the Soviet régime. The protest against the oppression of Ukraine by Moscow appeared also in the Ukrainian literature: a trend arose in the Ukrainian literature with orientation towards the free civilisation of Western Europe, against Russian Communist rule (the Communist Khvylyovy). Against such 'heresy' Moscow acted with ruthless repressions.

4. Ukraine in the Time of the First Five Years Plan (1929—1934)

185 The policy of collectivisation and industrialisation started in 1929 with enormous demands on Ukrainian national economy. Moscow used the Ukrainian national economy predominantly for

[1, Alexander Shumsky, Commissar of Education -- Analyst]

9: Prothero G-4 (no date) 1920 RD1 Ukraine RD1

175 whether Polish or Ukrainian, who were loyal to the Tsar, and to some extent also the Ukrainian peasants, at the expense of the Polish-Ukrainian middle class of landowners (*szlachta*), or the middle-class urban *intelligentsia* of Ukrainian nationality, who generally used the Russian language. Hence it was in these two latter classes that the spirit of protest still existed in
● 538 spite of its apparent hopelessness. The expression of this spirit of protest is to be found in the literature it produced, though this has obvious traces of Polish and Great Russian influence. Ukrainians such as Kapnist, Gogol, Velichko, Hanenko, Artemenski, and Hrebinka, were educated at the universities of Moscow and Kharkov, and wrote in the Russian language. To the same literary school belong Ivan Kotlarevski (1769–1839), the 'father' of Ukrainian literature, the first to write in Ukrainian as well as in Russian, and the Pole, Chodakowski, who was the first to study and collect the folk-lore of the Ukraine.

In the west of the Russian Ukraine a school of Ukrainian Polish poets arose, who wrote in Polish, but took as their subject the Ukraine and her liberation from Russia. Eminent among these were A. Malczewski, S. Goszynski,
175 B. Zaleski, and M. Czaikowski. Between 1803 and 1825, Adam Czartoryski and Tadeusz Czacki, two Polish Liberal nobles, acting for the Polish Education Committee under the then Liberal government of Alexander I, started numerous schools radiating from two chief centres—Krzemenietz, where a Catholic lyceum, and Human, where a Uniat college was founded. In 1818 a Masonic Lodge was instituted in Poltava, with the object of bringing about an understanding between the Liberals of Poland, the Ukraine, and Russia; and in 1825 an important meeting was held at Jitomir (*Slovyanskoye Sobranie*) of Dekabrist Russians, Poles, and Ukrainian *intelligentsia*—the latter still using the Polish and Russian languages. From 1825 dates the propaganda of the *lirniki* or Liberals, who wandered with their harps among the people like mediaeval bards, instilling into the Ukrainian peasants the ideas

9: Prothero G-4 (no date) 1920 RD1 Ukraine RD1

of the abolition of serfdom and of freedom from Russia. Most of these Liberals, as for example Rzewuski and Padurva, were Poles, or the products of Polish culture.

The Polish Rising of 1831.—This rising received much active support from the *intelligentsia* in the part of the Ukraine concerned; and the greatest of Ukrainian poets, Shevchenko (born 1814), was influenced by Polish middle-class Liberalism and Polish literature. The University of Kharkov, founded in 1805, had until 1831 many Polish professors lecturing in their own language. But this Polish cultural and political influence was checked when the Polish colleges in Vilna and Krzemenietz were suppressed in 1832, and a Russian university was founded at Kiev in 1834. This latter was at first distinctly governmental and official in character, but by the middle of the nineteenth century it had produced a new school of writers of far more active revolutionary tendencies than were ever manifested by the Kharkov circle. Apart from the Polish and Dekabrist risings and the literary attempts of polonized and russified Ukrainians, the first part of the nineteenth century is marked by a passive submission of the masses to the military and autocratic regime of Russia.

(*b*) *Russian, Polish, and Austrian Rivalry; Growth of Nationalism in the Ukraine* (1846–1914).—The modern nationalist movement in the Ukraine began with the foundation of a purely Ukrainian society called the 'Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood' in Kiev about 1846. This society had not merely the literary object of promoting the Ukrainian language, until then only in oral use among the peasants, but also a far-reaching political programme. Friendly feelings towards Polish and Russian Liberals still existed, and a federation of autonomous Slavonic states was aimed at. In this federation the Ukraine was to form two states, West Little Russia and East Little Russia. The creators of the society were the most prominent Ukrainian literary men, the poet Shevchenko, the historian Kostomarov, and the journalist Kulish.

the peerage and gave them rights and privileges for which the newly-created peers were obliged to pay with military service. In this way the lower szlachta increased to many hundreds of thousands of knights and barons who were often not much richer than the ordinary peasants. In the purely Polish regions and in West Ukraine there are still whole villages in which every peasant belongs to the nobility. Whoever was able to present his patent of nobility in Galicia after the partitioning of Poland was recognized as a peer by the Viennese court. In this way arose the Ritter /knights/ von Vitvicky, von Mogylnicki, von Kultshycki and whatever the rest are called.

Whereas the high nobility, with the exception of people like the former Princes Ostrozhsky, does not play any part in promoting culture in modern times in the Ukraine, the lesser nobility were for a long time practically the only bearers of Ukrainian culture. They made up the clergy almost exclusively. /100/ The pastors with their numerous children were often the only and the inexhaustible source of Ukrainian intelligentsia. Otherwise there were no intellectual professions open to the Ukrainians. Only the Catholics, that is to say, the Poles could become officials.

The Poles held to the old traditions of the lower nobility in their "Union of village szlachta". According to the latest Polish conception, the lower Ukrainian nobility are Ukrainized Poles. By promising them additional land and other material advantages, Warsaw wanted to catch the 400,000 "aristocratic souls". If this had succeeded, the Poles would have come a good deal closer to a majority in Galicia.

*

"In this cottage, in this grove
A hell I saw! Nothing but slavery
And bitter servitude, that never justice knows

539
538

Are there. No time remains for God.
There pain and sorrow
Spent my mother's strength
And drove her, young, into the grave...
And helplessly among his brood -
For we were naked then and young -
My father worked himself to death
And died a slave...And we, orphaned now,
Abandoned our little hut
And moved away..." (54)

54. Quoted from Ukrainian Literature in the Service of its Nation, page 8.

538 Taras Shevchenko is the author of this poem. With him begins a new period of progress for the Ukrainian people after the end of Cossack glory and the period of greatest decline. One of the first to lay the foundation for this development which has not yet ceased, is Ivan Kotliarevskyj with whom begins the period of modern Ukrainian literature freed from Byzantinism and religion bonds. /101/ This was toward the end of the eighteenth century. His travesty of Virgil's Aeneid appeared in 1798 and was the first work to be printed in the Ukrainian popular tongue which from then on becomes the literary language of the Ukrainians. In 1818 the first grammar follows. Around this time the ideas of the German Romanticists also come in and enduringly influence the Ukrainian intellectual world. People study their native language, tradition, folklore and history and in doing so, discover a past whose richness was scarcely imagined.

[177]

But the national impulses of the Ukrainian romanticists remain a "melancholy national feeling" until, around 1840, Taras Shevchenko stirs up the slumbering spirits. "The song of this poet had truly the effect of the resurrection trumpet of the archangel." Thus Panyko Kulish, the versatile brain of the Ukrainian in-

538 tellectual world at that time, characterized the influence of Shevchenko. His landlord had had him educated as a painter in Warsaw and Petersburg. By means of a lottery, the friends of the 24-year-old artist obtained the 2500 rubles necessary to buy off a serf. Shevchenko enjoyed his freedom from 1838 to 1847. Then he was arrested in Kiyev along with many other Ukrainian poets, authors and scholars. They all belonged to the "Cyril-Methodius Brotherhood" which inscribed on its banner the federation of all Slavic republics on a democratic basis. Taras Shevchenko was exiled to ten years of labor on a fortress in the Kirghiz steppes. "Writing and painting are prohibited!" the Czar noted in his own handwriting on the margin of the sentence. Four years after he was released the artist died far from home in Petersburg.

Merely a poet! And yet the nine years of freedom between serfdom and exile sufficed this tremendous spirit to build a bridge across the centuries - from the age of the Cossacks up to the new Ukrainian nationalism. Merely a poet, but what an explosive force was hidden in his /102/ ballads and poems, what effects were produced by his conjuring up of the past, his song of songs on freedom and his call to action! His "Kobsar" ('kobsar' was the name of the singers of famous folk epics from the time of the Cossacks) clothed all the national-political demands of the Ukrainian people in a sweeping poetic form and by this very means reached all classes of people.

*

539 "Hills upon hills, cloud-encircled,
Sown with sorrow, drenched in blood...
There, full of mercy, We shackled
Freedom and pursued her as she wandered
About the land, hungry, naked...Here lie

857 Before the age of twelve or thirteen, boys and girls rarely ever play together or have any other contact with each other. Whenever children are seen at play, a strict separation of the sexes is noticed. This is not the result of any special instruction on the part of the parents, and still less the outcome of imitation. [562] Besides their different spheres of interest, the boys manifest a certain pride and self-consciousness which causes them to band together, leaving the girls to themselves. With puberty, however, boys and girls mix freely and seek each other's company. Peasant children scarcely recognize any distinction between rich and poor; the sons and daughters of the wealthy associate with those of the poor without consciousness of superiority or inferiority on either side.[71]

538 861 598 The philosophy of parents with regard to the training of their children, in so far as they can be said to have one, is summed up in the following proverbial expressions: "The granting of freedom to children means the constraint of the parents"; [72] or, "Give the children freedom and you will find yourself in slavery." [73] Other examples of folk wisdom reveal a similar attitude: "A child will not grow up without a rod." "Do not give in to a child." "Love your child with your heart and drive it with your hands." [74] "Love your child like your soul, and shake it like the pear tree." [75] The burden of rearing children, although actually not very heavy, is, nevertheless, a source of complaint and finds expression in proverbs, *e.g.*, "To feed a child is like carrying a rock." "Small children don't let you sleep, and big ones don't let you live." "Whoever has no children does not know what trouble is." [76] Other proverbs reflect an opposite attitude towards children: "A mother of ten is a joy." [77] "If God grants children, He will provide for them." [78]

SAMUEL KOENIG

[71] Kaindl, *Die Huzulen*, pp. 8–9.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[113] [73] Franko, I., "Halicko-ruski narodni prypowidky," *Etnograficnyj Zbirnyk* (vols. xvi, xxiii–xxiv, Lwów, 1905–1908), xvi, 562.

[74] *Ibid.*, pp. 563–564.

[75] Kaindl, *Die Huzulen*, p. 8.

[76] Franko, *op. cit.*, pp. 564, 600.

[77] Kolberg, *Pokucie*, iii, 179.

[78] Franko, *op. cit.*, p. 598.

21; Kolarz J-4 (no date) 1952 R1 Soviet Union R1
Ukraine RD1

S.U. 562 635 UK 698 175 Soviet Russia has often followed in the footsteps of Czarist Russia, but as far as the appraisal of the Ukraine is concerned there is no continuity between old and new Russia. Czarist Russia simply denied the existence of a Ukrainian nation and denounced all Ukrainian national feeling as 'South Russian separatism'. Soviet policy, on the other hand, has encouraged Ukrainian nationalism in as far as it was able to serve Russia's territorial expansion. The most spectacular territorial advance which the Soviet Union has made since 1939 was that realized under the slogan 'unification of all Ukrainian lands in one national State'. In the course of this unification the Soviet Union not only re-annexed territories which Russia had lost in the Civil War but also occupied territories which had ceased to be 'Russian' ever since the Middle Ages, such as Eastern Galicia with the city of Lvov.

UK [101] There cannot be the slightest doubt about the existence of a Ukrainian nation which some Russian nationalists tried to deny in the past, but it would be a mistake to consider the Ukrainians, despite their numbers, as a nation equal in character to the French, Italians, Spaniards, etc., as the extremists among the Ukrainian nationalists would like to represent it. The Ukrainians cannot claim to be historically and culturally a nation so complete that they could afford to cut themselves loose from their Russian neighbours and exist without them.

All foreign invaders fighting Russia had illusions in this respect; they all believed in a separation of Ukraine and Muscovy and conducted their political warfare accordingly. The Swedish King, Charles XII, allied himself with the Ukrainian Cossack Hetman Mazeppa; Napoleon came to Russia with the project of a Ukrainian State, 'Napoleonide', cutting Russia off from the Black Sea and the Dardanelles. The Third Reich of Adolf Hitler also tried to play up the Ukrainian issue against Great Russia.

'LITTLE RUSSIA' AND 'NEW RUSSIA'

UK 101 186 538 There is every justification in the demand for a genuinely autonomous Ukraine but there is no logic and no life in an anti-Russian Ukrainian nationalist ideology. Neither Russian and Ukrainian history, nor the area of Russian and Ukrainian settlement, nor even Russian and Ukrainian literature can be separated from each other. Gogol, for instance, who wrote in Russian only, can be claimed by the Ukrainians not only because he was born in 'Little Russia', as the Ukraine used to be called in Czarist times, but also because some of his great works are devoted to his homeland, including the most Ukrainian literary work *Taras Bulba*. The Ukrainians have failed to produce any Ukrainian-writing poet or writer who even approximates to the importance of a Gogol.

Nor is Gogol an isolated example. Count Alexey Tolstoy too belongs to some extent to the Ukraine and no Ukrainian poet has succeeded in paying to his homeland a more beautiful lyrical tribute than Tolstoy's.

Were the Ukraine 'Little Russia' only, the land of the Cossacks, the problem would be more straightforward; but the Ukraine is, apart from minor territories, at least Little Russia plus New Russia. New Russia comprises those territories along the shores of the Black Sea which were incorporated into the Russian Empire for the most part under Catherine the Great. It was only by the amalgamation of Little Russia with a large part of New Russia that the Ukraine obtained a sea-coast and was able to include within its borders places like Odessa, Kherson, Mariupol and Nikolayev whose history was in no way linked with that of the Ukrainian Cossack Hetmans. New Russia became a true microcosm of Europe. Just as the ancient and medieval history of New Russia is a mosaic of the history of many peoples which had settled on the northern shores of the Black Sea, traded with the goods and products of its hinterlands and founded states, a history of Greeks and Scythians, Khazars, Goths, Genoese and Tartars, so too the history of modern New Russia is a tale of all sorts of races. People from many lands transformed the steppe into arable soil, built ports and railway lines and developed the industry of the Donets Basin. New Russia was a little America in the sense of being a melting-pot of European races, with the difference, however, that not all pioneer settlers forgot the language of their forefathers in the Ukrainian-Russian surroundings.* The people who brought New Russia into being included sons of every nation of the Balkans, many Germans and even individual Frenchmen who assumed high administrative posts there. At least one Briton played a distinguished part in the development of New Russia, John Hughes, a pioneer of coal-mining in the Donets region, to whose initiative is due the foundation of the big industrial centre now called Stalino. (Until the early twenties the place was called after him 'Yuzovka'.)

UKRAINIAN DIASPORA IN THE U.S.S.R.

Whilst Russians and other peoples shared with the Ukrainians the credit for the colonization of what is to-day the Ukrainian S.S.R., millions of Ukrainians now live dispersed all over the Soviet Union.

The Ukraine, being a densely populated country, was able to contri-

* An ethnical group of colonists in New Russia, who were completely assimilated by their Russian-Ukrainian surroundings, were the Serbs, of whom about 100,000 came to the Southern Ukraine between 1739 and 1752. The Serbs colonized two Ukrainian regions, one on the right bank of the Dnieper, originally called 'New Serbia', and the other in the Donets Basin, called 'Slavyanoserbia'. A century after the Serbian pioneer immigration into New Russia the Serb element could no longer be traced in any population statistics of the Russian Empire.

21: Kolarz J-4 (no date) 1952 R1 Soviet Union
UKRAINE RD1

themselves so long without assistance from a part of the Soviet Ukrainian peasantry.

While the armed struggle of Ukrainian nationalists was confined to a small fringe along the Ukrainian border, the Soviet Government had to face more subtle forms of opposition throughout the Soviet Ukraine. One of the outstanding features of the post-war development in the Ukraine was that the same cultural institutions which in the purges of the thirties had been compelled to change their nationalistic Ukrainian personnel from top to bottom, were again involved in difficulties with the Soviet authorities.

This was particularly true of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and especially of its Institute for Language and Literature and its Institute for History. The former produced in 1945 an *Essay on the History of Ukrainian Literature*, whose authors stressed the dependence of Ukrainian literature on the West and 'concealed that Russian and Ukrainian literatures exercised a mutual fertilizing influence on each other in the course of centuries'.[19]

Even more serious 'nationalist excesses' were committed in the field of history writing. It seems that practically all major historical works which the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences published in 1941–5 contained 'serious mistakes of a nationalistic character'. For several years the party and state authorities did not pay much attention to the works of Ukrainian academicians; but after 1946–7 the leading party organs restarted to analyse Ukrainian historical writings and pointed out that Ukrainian historians had never, in fact, succeeded in overcoming the influence of the nationalistic-bourgeois school of Professor Hrushevsky.[20]

In the light of official Soviet admissions the ideological consolidation of the Ukraine seemed not to have advanced by a single inch since the days when Hrushevsky was still the teacher of the historians and Khvylovy the authority for those dealing with problems of Ukrainian literature. Twenty years after Khvylovy's first expulsion from the Communist Party, and fifteen years after his suicide, orthodox Ukrainian Bolsheviks were still haunted by the fear of 'Khvylovy-ist ideas' and were active in opposing them.

The first step in the purge of Ukrainian literature in the post-war period was the replacement of the editorial boards of the three leading Ukrainian literary journals *Vitchizna* (Fatherland), *Dnipro* (Dnieper) and *Radyansky Lviv* (Soviet Lvov). All three journals had been accused of systematically printing nationalist novels and articles. As the Ukrainian Union of Soviet Writers was obviously responsible for ideological offences committed in literary journals published on Ukrainian territory, the purge had to be extended to this organization as well. The leading personalities of the writers' union, including its president,

[Cf. cat. 116, pp. 30-31, R1 Sov. Union; 21: Kolarz -- Analyst]

21: Kolarz J-4 (no date) 1952 R1 Soviet Union
UKRAINE RD1

186 Maxim Rilsky*, were dismissed in November 1946. Rilsky, one of the most outstanding poets of the Soviet Ukraine, was charged with being a 'prisoner of bourgeois nationalism'. He had not only 'sinned' in his works but he had also delivered a particularly objectionable lecture, 'Kiev in the history of the Ukraine', in which he 'idealized the old patriarchal order and depicted in rosy idyllic colours the conditions under the rule of landowners and bourgeois'. Together with Rilsky a whole group of Ukrainian writers was accused of nationalism, 'Khvylovy-ism' and reactionary tendencies, including I. Senchenko, Y. Yanovsky and P. Panch.[21]

Maxim Rilsky was replaced as president of the Ukrainian Union of Soviet Writers by A. Y. Korneichuk, author of a large number of political plays, who had always accurately interpreted the party line and had earned nothing but praise from the supreme Soviet leadership. It was Korneichuk's task to lead Ukrainian literature on the road of strict Soviet Patriotism and 'Socialist Realism'. Indeed, Ukrainian writers, publishing houses and literary journals became more careful and it appeared during a certain period as if Korneichuk had really succeeded in his assignment. The 'Festival of Ukrainian Art and Literature' held in Moscow in June 1951 showed, however, that this was a deception. The festival gave the members of the Bolshevik Politbureau an opportunity of getting a closer look at Ukrainian cultural life. They found that Ukrainian authors and artists had still not overcome their ideological mistakes. Even Korneichuk himself who was expected to give a good example to his fellow-writers had committed a serious offence. He had written a libretto for the opera 'Bogdan Khmelnitsky', which, from the official point of view, was not sufficiently anti-Polish and not eloquent enough in its pro-Russian bias. Through its mouthpiece, *Pravda*, the Politbureau not only denounced Korneichuk and other writers for ideological distortions but also reprimanded the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party for having neglected the political education of the Ukrainian intellectual élite. The Ukrainian Central Committee, mindful of what had happened to the Ukrainian Communist leaders in the thirties, immediately pledged itself to remedy the situation.[22]

THE UKRAINE AS A FACTOR IN SOVIET 'WORLD POLITICS'

648 645 After having fulfilled its original mission of bringing all Ukrainian lands into the fold of the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Ukraine was given a new task.

* Rilsky, like most great poets of the Soviet Ukraine, has a 'nationalistic past'. In 1934 he and another poet laureate of the Ukraine, Pavel Tychina, were rebuked for their 'hesitation' in the artistic expression of themes and ideas new to them. Yet another contemporary Ukrainian poet, Mikola Bazhan, who is not only like Tychina a member of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet but also a Vice-Premier of the Ukrainian Government, used to be likewise blamed for the 'nationalistic soil in which his creations have been rooted'.[23]